

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. V

MAY, 1905

NO. 11

Carl Marx and His Latter Day Critics.

MARXISM—that theoretical system of which Karl Marx was the chief exponent, and which its adepts are wont to term “Scientific Socialism”—has reached a stage in its existence which marks it as one of those systems of thought which in the history of the intellectual development of the human race are epoch-making and stamp their character upon the age the intellectual life of which they, respectively dominate. While the fight for its existence is still raging, and it is growing in intensity from day to day, the nature of the fight betrays the difference in its position. It no longer fights for recognition, so to speak, but, on the contrary, it fights to maintain the position of an established doctrine, I might say *the* established doctrine, which it has assumed and occupied since the appearance of the last volume of *Capital* in 1894.

Marx-criticism is not any the less frequent or any the less vehement to-day than it was at any time during the life of his doctrines. Quite the reverse: At no time since the first foundations of the great system of thought which bears his name were laid down by Karl Marx, more than fifty years ago, have his assailants been so numerous or so active as they are now. Marxism—opposition to Marxism—is the moving cause, the burden of the song, the ever-recurring *leit-motif*, of every new book, pamphlet, and essay on philosophy, sociology, or political economy, that lays any pretensions to being abreast of the modern current of thought. There are now being published numerous periodicals—weekly, monthly, quarterly etc.,—devoted exclus-

ively, openly or covertly, to the fighting of Marxism. This is itself, of course, one of the manifestations of the dominating influence which the teachings of Marx and his disciples have obtained over the minds of human kind: it now requires the constant efforts of a great army of intellectuals to combat, and that with very doubtful success, the progress of the teaching which less than a quarter of a century ago would have been passed by one of them as a negligible quantity in the sum total of our intellectual life.

Aside however from its volume, the tone of the anti-Marx-literature of the present day shows the change in the position of Marxism. The note of personal hostility towards Marx, the slighting estimate of his position in the realm of thought, and of the importance of his system in the development of ideas,—which were once common to the majority of Marx critics—are entirely absent from this literature. On the contrary, the distinguishing feature of this anti-Marxian literature is the homage which is paid by all to Marx the man and the thinker. More important, however, is the fact that most of the new critics of Marxism do not treat it as a new-fangled doctrine the correctness of which is yet to be proven, but, on the contrary, as the old-established and accepted doctrine which they attempt to prove false, in whole or in part, and which, they claim, must, therefore, be revised; supplemented or superseded. No one, however, dares openly defend the theories which Marxism has supplanted. Almost every one admits expressly the justifiableness of Marx's criticism of the theories which predominated before his advent, and that Marx's theories were correct at the time they were first stated and a proper generalization of the data then at hand. What they claim is, that later developments have shown that they were based on insufficient data, and that our present knowledge requires the revision of some of its tenets or the supplementing it by some qualifying truths, according to some, or, that the whole system be thrown overboard, it having been built on false foundations, according to others. Most of the critics, however, stop at revision. Hence, the name *Revisionists*, under which most of the newer Marx-critics are known, and the term *Revisionism* applied to their writings and teachings.

The most important phenomena, however, in this connection and that which, to my mind, conclusively establishes not only the pre-eminent position occupied to-day by Marxism as the recognized and established sociological doctrine, but also the fact that there is no doctrine capable of competing with it for establishment or even of dividing honors with it, are the writings of those of the critics of Marxism who claim that the whole system must be thrown overboard as unscientific. These writings are

the most edifying sort of reading for a Marxist. I shall have occasion, later on, to examine these writings more particularly. Here I wish to say only this: These latter-day critics of Marx do not dare accept in its entirety any other system which has been advocated before their advent; and they do not, with some exceptions which are quite negligible (of which I shall, however, and nevertheless, treat later on), advance any system, wholly or partly original with its author, which would be capable of taking the place of Marxism as an explanation of social phenomena. They almost all, therefore, fall into what may well be termed *Nihilism*, that is to say, they are led to deny the existence, nay, even the possibility, of any social science. In other words: Marxism is so much *the* scientific doctrine in its sphere (which covers all the life of humanity in organized society, including all its social and intellectual manifestations) that you cannot destroy it without at the same time destroying all scientific knowledge of the subject.

It must be said, however, in justice to these writers, that this Nihilism is not confined to those who would destroy Marxism root and branch. A leaning towards Nihilism is discoverable also in most of those critics of Marxism who go no further than revision, as is well exemplified in their leader Eduard Bernstein, who attempted to prove the *impossibility* of scientific socialism, in a lecture delivered before a body of students at Berlin.

Of course, this Nihilism is not equally pronounced in all of Marx's critics. But it is to be found as a more or less conscious substratum of their criticism in all except those who confine their criticism to some one phase or theory of the Marxian system. These latter critics, not dealing with the system as a whole, naturally do not feel the void created by the supposed demolition of the Marxian theory, and can therefore run their course merrily without feeling constrained to either fill the void or account for its existence.

Those however who viewed and reviewed the system as a whole could not but feel the aching void which would be left if the Marxian system were demolished; they naturally looked for another system to be reared in its place, and, that task proving beyond their powers, they fell into Nihilism. Thus the question whether Marxism is or is not science turned into the question whether there is, or could be, any social science. How keenly this was felt by some of the critics of Marxism can be judged from the following statement of Dr. Paul Weisengruen, one of the ablest critics of Marxism and one of those who believe that the whole Marxian system must be abandoned as being radically and basically false. He says, alluding to the so-called "crisis" in Marxism, by which term the Revisionist movement

is sometimes designated—"The crisis in Marxism means a crisis in the whole range of social science."

All this makes it absolutely imperative to restate the Marxian theory, in the light of this new criticism, examining the objections raised with a view of determining whether and how far this criticism has lead, or must needs lead, to a revision, modification, or abandonment, of any of the subsidiary or tributary theories of Karl Marx; and whether such revision, modification or abandonment, if any be necessary, affects the Marxian system as a whole.

This is the only way in which the latter-day critics of Marxism can be properly answered. It is absolutely impossible to reply within the space of a few magazine articles, separately, to every book and article written by them. Besides, this would be a waste of energy even if it were possible, for a good deal of this literature is mere repetition or based on the same assumptions of fact or logical deduction. And it is also impossible to take one of these writers, as typical of the whole movement, analyze his arguments, and estimate the value of the whole thereon, for the reason that Marx-critics are an extremely independent lot and it is therefore hard to find two of them agreeing on all points. Not only does each of them follow his own or what he at least thinks is his own line of argument, and draw his own conclusions, but these arguments and conclusions are very irreconcilable with one another and often have a tendency to refute one another. Furthermore, they do not very often agree with each other as to what is Marxism, that is to say, as to what are the essential elements of Marx's theoretical system. So that among the critics of Marxism the rule seems to obtain that not only does each tub of criticism stand on its own bottom, but that every man constructs his own Marxism. With some of these critics, of the cheaper sort, of course, this method plays peculiar pranks. A Marxism is constructed, which, while easy of refutation, is so much different from the doctrine of Karl Marx and his disciples that nobody cares a whit as to what happens to it.

All of which goes to show that it would not be fair, and well-nigh impossible, to treat any one of these critics as typical of them all. Each is entitled to a separate hearing, if he is to be answered. This claim was expressly put forth by one critic of Marxism who is not unknown to the readers of the REVIEW. He argued that while Marxists should be held responsible for one another for the reason that Marxism was a well-defined system of thought and body of doctrine to which all adepts of the school are expected to adhere, the opponents of Marxism, and particularly those of a nihilistic bent of mind, belong to no school, believe in no particular system, in short, are a lot of free lances and must be treated accordingly.

This makes a systematic review of the Literature of Anti-Marxism—the only term which is comprehensive enough to include all of the Marx-criticism—impossible. I will, therefore, at this time, only briefly characterize its leading features, and mention the most important authors, leaving such discussion of any individual writer or argument as may be necessary to the time when that particular part of the Marxian system to which it may be most pertinent will be taken up in the topical discussion which will follow.

The appearance, in 1894, of Karl Marx's chief work, *Capital*, naturally led to a revival of Marx-criticism. But this revival was not in any way general, and nothing of any importance in this line followed immediately the publication of the third volume of *Capital*, with the single exception of Boehm-Bawerk's essay on "Marx and the close of his system," which, because of the method in which the subject is treated and the tone of the discussion, really belongs to the old rather than the new style of Marx-criticism. Boehm-Bawerk's essay which deals with Marx's economic teachings was followed, in 1896, by Professor Rudolph Stammler's important work on the Materialistic Conception of History. The real beginning, however, of the anti-Marxian literary crusade dates from the publication by Eduard Bernstein in 1897 of his series of articles in the *Neue Zeit*, the organ of the German Marxists, under the title "Socialist Problems," in which the first attempts at Revisionism manifested themselves. Later, in discussing the net results of the new Marx-criticism, I shall endeavor to explain the cause which led Bernstein to a discussion of these "problems." Here it is sufficient to say that aside from the inherent importance of the problems and the causes which led up to and brought about their discussion the personality of Bernstein played an important part in the profound sensation which his articles, and afterward his book "*Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*," created.

It must be remembered that for years Eduard Bernstein had been one of the recognized exponents of Marxism. He was the editor of the Zurich "Social Democrat," the official organ of the German Social Democracy during the Bismarck anti-Socialist laws. He had for years been closely associated with Frederick Engels, the co-worker of Karl Marx and one of the fathers of "Marxism." He was, therefore, rightfully looked upon by both socialists and non-socialists alike as one of the leading representatives of scientific socialism. His demand, therefore, for a revision of Marxism gave an impetus to Marx-criticism never equalled before. Everything now made for Revisionism. There was a general overhauling of old beliefs and accepted doctrines. The old opponents of Marxism, both open and covert, took heart and mustered again in battle array. Most of them, however, changed

their weapons: They threw away the old-stock arguments of the old and discarded theoretical arsenals which had become absolutely useless, and had therefore been left to rest and rust, and took up the more modern weapons of the Revisionists. Hence, the Revisionist hue of all latter-day anti-Marxian literature.

The most important of the writers to be considered, besides those already mentioned, are: Werner Sombart, Th. G. Masaryk, Paul Barth, Rudolph Wenckstern, Franz Oppenheimer, Ludwig Woltman, Tugan Baranowsky, and Jean Jaures. Another Revisionist whose writings although of little intrinsic value, arrest our attention by the peculiar reflection they cast upon Revisionism, is Dr. Alfred Nossig, the only man who attempted to raise Revisionism to the dignity of a system.

According to the manner in which they treat the subject, the Marx-critics may be roughly divided in three classes: First, the philosophers, who dwell principally on Marx's philosophic system; secondly, the economists, who examine his economic theories; and thirdly, the sociologists, that is to say those who concern themselves chiefly with Marx's theories of the laws which govern the development of the capitalistic system of society. That does not mean that this division is in any way strictly observed. To begin with, there are those who, like Bernstein, treat of all the three subdivisions of the subject, although separately from each other. Then there are those who, while making one of the divisions their chief topic permit their discussion to overlap into the other provinces.

In order that the reader may have well in mind during the following discussion the co-relation of the different parts of the Marxian system, and particularly the inseparability of his "philosophy" from his sociology and economic theory, properly so-called, a brief sketch of the system is herewith given:

"In making their livelihood together men enter into certain necessary involuntary relations with each other, industrial relations which correspond to whatever stage society has reached in the development of its material productive forces. The totality of these industrial relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which the legal and political superstructure is built, and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The method of producing the material livelihood determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not men's consciousness which determines their life; on the contrary, it is their social life which determines their consciousness.

"At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the old conditions of production, or, what is its legal expression, with the old property relations under which these forces have hitherto been

exerted. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into fetters of production. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic basis the whole vast superstructure becomes slowly or rapidly revolutionized.

"At any given stage of the development of society based on the private ownership of property that social class which owns the tools of production then in use dominates that society politically. When the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the old conditions of production, a new class has arisen in that society, which disputes the political supremacy of the old dominating class, the class which owns and controls the new material productive forces, and a struggle for life and death then ensues between these two classes. In this struggle the new class invariably comes out victorious. In the social revolution which follows the victory of the new class the new material productive forces are unchained and are given free scope to assert themselves, and the new class, controlling these forces, becomes politically supreme.

"A form of society never breaks down until all the productive forces are developed for which it affords room. New and higher relations of production are never established until the material conditions of life to support them have been generated in the lap of the old society itself. Therefore mankind always sets for itself only such tasks as it is able to perform; for upon close examination it will always be found that the task itself only arises where the material conditions for its solution are already at hand or are at least in process of formation.

"The industrial relations arising out of the capitalistic method of production constitute the last of the antagonistic forms of social production; antagonistic not in the sense of an individual antagonism, but of an antagonism growing out of the social conditions of individuals. But the productive forces which are developed in the lap of the capitalistic society create at the same time the material conditions needed for the abolition of this antagonism. The capitalist form of society, therefore, brings to a close this prelude to the history of human society."

The material conditions needed for the abolition of this antagonism have matured in the lap of the capitalistic system itself by the time it has reached that stage of development when the material productive forces come into conflict with the old conditions of production, and these conditions of production have become obstacles in the way of production and to social revolution.

The break-down of the capitalistic system of production leading to social revolution will be brought about by the inherent contradictions of the capitalistic system of production.

The laws which govern the capitalistic form of production will ultimately lead to the extinction of the middle strata of society as independent, property-owning, classes, and divide society into two classes: the very small minority owning all the wealth of society, and the large mass of the people, the working class, who own nothing, not even their own bodies if they want to keep from starvation. At the same time the development of machinery will continue to throw more and more workingmen out of employment and make the share of those workingmen who are employed in the product produced by them grow continually smaller. The productive forces of society will not only become fettered, so that they will largely have to remain idle, but even that portion which will not remain in enforced idleness will be able to produce only with tremendous accompanying waste and convulsive interruptions until finally a point will be reached when, by the very conditions of capitalistic production, because of the large portion of the working class out of employment and the small share of the goods produced by them received by the employed workingman in return for their labor, there will accumulate such an enormous mass of goods which the capitalists will be unable to dispose of, that is to say find a market for, that production will have to be indefinitely suspended.

Meanwhile the discontent of the working class has been growing, and the sense of the injustice done to it accumulating. It has developed a code of ethics of its own: Having no property themselves the workingmen have lost all sense of the sacredness of private property. Most property being owned by corporations having "no body to be kicked and no soul to be damned," they fail to see the necessity of private ownership or the usefulness of private owners. They have nothing to lose and they have grown bold. They have forgotten their duties to their families, for which they can do nothing and which are, for the most part, their independent co-workers instead of dependents, but their sense of duty to their class has been constantly growing upon them during the long period of struggle preceding the final encounter.

The working class has been organized by the very process of capitalistic production and exploitation. It has been educated to understand its own powers and possibilities. It is animated by the world-historic mission devolved upon it. It contains within its own ranks all the elements necessary for conducting the production of society on a higher plane, so as to utilize all the productive powers of society. The mechanical development of productive forces requires production on a large co-operative basis. The working class takes possession of the social machinery, and the real history of human society begins—the co-operative commonwealth.

L. BOUDIN.

(To be continued.)

The Judges' Oath.

THE Statutes of the United States require that all federal judges shall take the following oath of office: (U. S. Revised Statutes, sec. 712):

"I do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as judge, according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution and law of the United States; so help me God."

This Statute was originally passed in 1789, 116 years ago. What we wish to call attention to especially in this oath is its reference to the "rich" and "poor." As socialism grows in strength and the class war becomes more clearly defined, it becomes more and more apparent that the courts are the last resort and bulwark of the capitalist class. The charge of the socialists that the courts are under the control of the capitalist class, which was formerly ignored, is being verified so constantly that silence no longer answers the purpose. It has become fashionable now to quote the judges' oath to prove the impartiality of the courts as between the capitalist class and the labor class. Hardly a lawyers' banquet is held anywhere nowadays but after the champagne some one sings the praises of our impartial courts and closes by reciting the judges' oath. One justice of the Supreme Court in particular has made a specialty of this judicial fad of self patting-on-the-back, reiterating *ad nauseum* that seductive phrase about doing equal right to the poor and to the rich.

It is hard enough to endure class oppression without having it rubbed in as a blessing. Let us, therefore, proceed to puncture this inflation of ignorance and hypocrisy, and learn why it is that judges who deny the existence of classes in this country, admit that there is a rich class and a poor class, but cannot admit that there is a capitalist class and a labor class.

When this oath was established in 1789 the population of this country consisted principally of small farmers, merchants and mechanics working with their own tools. Some had more, some had less. Some were called rich, some poor. Few were without the tools to employ themselves and such as lacked tools could acquire them by a few years' work as journeymen. All expected

to work and own the products of their labor. The words "capitalist" and "proletarian" were unknown: so were the things for which these words stand. Corporations were practically unknown. Business and industry were carried on by individuals and the prevailing form of property was individual property operated by the owner himself. This is the kind of property which, together with slave property, was guaranteed protection by the constitution; under this protection and the fostering care of our "independent" judiciary it has nearly all been wiped out of existence! We are not complaining particularly of the fact that the judiciary is dependent on the capitalist class. What we complain of is the hypocrisy which denies this dependence. Did you ever stop to think what it would mean to have an independent judiciary? Independent of whom? If the judiciary were really independent of all the rest of the people it would constitute an absolute despotism. What is meant by an independent judiciary is one which is independent of the votes of the working class and dependent on the favor of the capitalist class.

Many socialists will not agree with us, but we are one of those who hold that the existing State does pretend and must pretend to be established to promote justice, public welfare and the education of all. We are willing to take it at its word, accept its own Bill of Rights, and then say to it, "Thou hypocrite! out of thy own mouth shalt thou be condemned." This line of attack is particularly well adapted to use against our boastful judiciary. It is not only on the economic field that capitalism has forged the weapons of its own destruction. The same thing is not less true in the juridical-ethical field. Give us control of the equity courts and we can hoist capitalism by its own maxims of equity. Take Pomeroy's Equity Jurisprudence, which has been called the chancellor's bible, and compare its doctrines with the performances of our modern courts. One judge, strange to say, went so far as to admit that there is a labor question, but added, as he signed the order for an injunction that the labor question is something not for the present age to settle but for the future.

These very courts of alleged "equity" which were once so revolutionary as against the feudal law are now used as the greatest engines of oppression against the working class. Socialists lack the sense of humor; they take such things as justice and equity seriously, while capitalists treat them as a huge joke. It is the peculiar nemesis of the capitalist class, more so than with previous ruling classes, that it is compelled to play the role of hypocrite. It must pretend to favor the uplifting of the masses while in reality its very existence depends on keeping the masses down. This has been explained with great force and beauty in his "Workingman's Programme" by Ferdinand Lassalle, who

was something of a jurist himself. Through historical development a condition has been reached where hypocrisy is as essential to the existence of the capitalist class as economic supremacy. The observance of law and the breaking of law are both equally fatal to this class. The making of apologies and excuses now constitutes its main occupation—apologies for breaking some of the laws and excuses for not observing others.

But we are digressing. Let us get back to the rich and the poor.

Here a few definitions will not be out of place for some of our readers.

A rich man is one who has considerable property, but gets no income therefrom. He is able to live without fear of want and without labor by consuming his principal.

A capitalist is one who has considerable property but does not consume any part of it for living purposes, neither does he perform any useful labor. Keeping his capital intact, he lives solely on his income which those who labor pay to him willingly (so it is claimed). The difference between a rich man and a capitalist is that one lives off of his principal and the other off of his income.

A poor man is one who has little property, which he cannot afford to consume, but must preserve as a means to assist his labor. He produces his livelihood by his labor, but it is not dependent on others for the opportunity to labor. He is usually represented as owning a cottage. "The law protects equally the poor man's cottage and the rich man's palace," was the phrase recently used at a lawyers' banquet in Chicago.

A proletarian is one who has no cottage, no principal, no income, no tools, and hence no opportunity to labor. The only property he has is labor power and this is useless without the opportunity to apply it. He buys this opportunity by selling his body to a so-called "employer" for board and clothes, so-called "wages."

The difference between a poor man and a proletarian is that one has an opportunity to labor with his own tools and owns his products: hence he is called a free laborer; the other has no opportunity to labor until he buys this privilege by selling his hands and is hence called a "hired hand;" he has ceased to be a person. He owns no products.

The individual property of 1789 was succeeded in the first half of the 19th century by the individual capitalist and by partnership property; and now this too has been superseded by corporate property. The bulk of the business to-day, outside of agriculture, is carried on by corporations "for profit."

In 1789 there was very little public property. There were no large cities or municipal corporations. Some of these gigantic

aggregations of common interests to-day exceed in population and wealth all of the original thirteen states together at the time the judges' oath was formulated. These cities own vast communal property, giving them separate property rights as against the property rights of individuals and private corporations. How these communal rights are protected by federal courts can be seen in the Chicago Traction litigation. In 1789 the rights of the public were so hazy as to give rise to the proverb that the public has no rights. In law books "property rights" meant rights of individual property owners, not the rights of the public as a property owner. In judicial decisions there was a strong tendency to minimize the rights of the public as against the rights of a private individual or private corporation "for profit." The public broadly speaking being the thing out of which profits are made, the absurdity of giving a corporation a charter to make profits out of the public and then protecting the public against its operations is apparent at a glance. The public corporation exists for welfare only, which is an indefinite and insignificant thing compared with profits. The public, though a large property owner in its corporate capacity, cannot be classified under the head of rich or poor.

The various kinds of property we have described differ not only in quantity but also in quality. The fact that all kinds have or are assumed to have a market or sale value which can be expressed in money and are hence homogeneous is misleading. Each has a specific character of its own, distinct from the other kinds, in fact so distinct and different that these different kinds of property cannot flourish well contemporaneously, but only successively. They are at war with each other and the form which prevails for the time being gives the character to the period. "Rich" and "poor" refer to quantity of property only and not to quality; in the sense of "great" and "small" they might be applied to the owners of any of the different kinds of property. The acme of hypocrisy is reached in pretending that property is all alike in substance and differs only in quantity or amount.

The different kinds of property are described as individual, capitalist, corporate, labor-power, communal, slave, feudal, etc. These words refer to quality, not to quantity. These forms of property determine the classes into which the people are divided. No question of rich or poor arises. When Washington in his farewell address warned the people so earnestly, almost frantically, against the evils of party strife he truly saw that the comparatively homogeneous individual property of the early colonists was breaking up into new and irreconcilable forms which would be the bases of classes and parties. There is no way of protecting one form of property without violating or disparaging some other form. The struggles culminating in the Civil war arose from the

protection of capitalist property by the violation of slave property, or vice versa, and resulted in the total abolition of one form of property. Capitalist property maintains itself by the violation of labor property. The present continuous industrial war will result in the protection of labor property and communal property by the abolition of capitalist property. The essence of capitalist property is not the possession or ownership of physical objects, called wealth, but is the right to collect a perpetual income from other people or from society at large. This right constitutes a social privilege of substantially the same character as the old feudal privileges and by its very nature admits of no adequate compensation.* It is easy enough to compensate a man for his property, but not for the right to collect an income upon it, because the property given in compensation will lack this income producing feature.

Bearing these distinctions in mind, what is the use of talking about justice for the proletarian? There can be no justice for him except to abolish proletarianism. Having no external property, he is neither rich nor poor. He is the social cypher who, though nothing in himself, makes the higher denominations possible. Justice for the proletarian in the courts! Justice between a hired "hand" and a huge trust! Between a human commodity and a corporate abstraction! There is no congruity, no common ground or common denominator which can be resorted to for the purpose of comparing them and adjusting their equities. They are incommensurable things. Hence in criminal law they are punished differently, the one with imprisonment, the other with fines only, because no question of dealing out justice to "persons" arises here at all.

If it is thought necessary to have the judges parade their hypocrisy before the public, drag from the closet this social skeleton of class oppression which haunts present society, and emphasize the impossibility of doing justice under class rule, we would suggest an oath somewhat on the following lines:

"I do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons, or class or sexes or corporations or municipalities; and will do equal right to the poor and to the rich; to the capitalist, to the independent worker and to the proletarian; to the woman laborer, to the child laborer and to those who seek employment and cannot find it; to the scab, not only while he is breaking a strike, but also when the strike is over and he is out of a job; to the corporation organized solely for profit and to the human being organized and existing not solely for profit; to labor unions and employers' unions; that in all cases which seem to be equally balanced or where the law is capable of two interpretations, one favorable to capitalists, the other favorable to

proletarians, I will decide in favor of the capitalists; likewise in matters which are not compulsory upon the courts, but rest in the discretion of the judge, I will favor the capitalists as against the proletarians; so help me God."

MARCUS HITCH.

The Jesuits' Attack on Socialism.

IT has long been recognized that the most uncompromising and in many respects the ablest opponents of socialism were to be found within the Catholic Church and particularly within that organization known as the Jesuits. A work has recently appeared which may be taken as the final climax of Jesuitical scholarship and the best or worst attack that the intellectual ability and political training of that famous organization is capable of producing. This is a translation of Victor Cathrein's (S. J.) "Socialism, Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application." We are informed that this is the "authorized translation of the eighth German edition with special reference to the condition of Socialism in the United States, revised and enlarged by Victor F. Gettelmann, S. J." Published by Benziger Bros., "Printers to the Holy Apostolic See." That no question may be raised as to its authoritative character, as an expression of church attitude we find on the second page *Nihil Obstat*, signed Remy Lafort, Censor Librorum, and below that again comes *Imprimatur*, John M. Farley, Archbishop of New York. This work in its German form has been before the public for about fifteen years. During all this time it has been going through various editions, with constant modifications and probably readaptations as its authors might consider most effective for the crushing of socialism. It is a tribute to the strength of the socialist movement in America that this, the heaviest gun of ecclesiastical scholasticism has now been erected on American soil. In the author's preface we are told that:

"In view of this gigantic development of social democracy it certainly behooves every man of culture, but above all the leaders in civil and social life, to become familiar with socialist ideas, to make themselves acquainted with the scientific basis so much vaunted by socialists, and to form an independent judgment concerning them.

"To oppose the spread of socialism by means of police regulations, as was done by the famous Socialist Law of Germany, must always prove utterly abortive; in this struggle intellectual and moral weapons rather will be used to advantage."

Therefore we know it is because socialism has become so strong as to be looked upon as a menace to capitalism that the present edition has appeared. The American translator assures us of the international character of the work by calling attention

to the fact that it has already been translated into eight of the European languages. Again, it is a special tribute to American Socialism that Jesuitical scholarship has not contented itself with but a mere translation, but has increased the size of the work by the addition of material applying especially to America, to twice its former size. Remembering the unlimited leisure and thorough scholastic training accorded to this branch of the Catholic priesthood we may be sure that this work represents practically all that can be said about socialism by its worst enemies.

A work so produced and so endorsed and therefore backed by the circulating power of one of the most perfect of social organizations is assured of a large circulation. On the practical side therefore the work deserves careful attention from the Socialists. If the Socialists can meet and overthrow the arguments contained in this volume they will, on the principle that the greater must always contain the less, have vanquished all minor oppositions. Let us then proceed to a consideration of the work. It opens with the familiar study of the transition of Socialism from the Utopian to the scientific stage, and the author correctly concludes that there is really no connection between modern socialism and primitive communism, or on the doctrinal side between the work of the Utopians and the work of modern Socialists.

"The roots of modern socialism are to be found first of all in the great development of industry and the consequent modification of social conditions dating from the latter part of the eighteenth century. Since the French Revolution the unhampered development of industrial forces in unrestricted competition has undoubtedly brought about astounding results in the field of technical discoveries and their application to industry and commerce. But one of these results was also the great division of society into two hostile classes—a small number of wealthy capitalists, and an immense multitude of laborers—which classes are usually designated respectively as *capital* and *labor*. But above all, the *proletariat*, that homeless, floating population of our great cities which has already assumed gigantic proportions, is the almost inevitable result of modern industry, in as far as by its machinery it practically precludes the existence of independent tradesmen and promotes the concentration of great masses of factory laborers.

"Side by side with this increasing proletariat the disruption of family life, drunkenness, and dissolute morals have been growing apace. Moreover, by the baneful influence of the higher classes gross materialism and an insatiable craving for enjoyment have penetrated the masses of the people, whilst numerous upstarts with their quickly amassed wealth openly revel in senseless luxury. Thus the smouldering fire of discontent needed but a breeze to fan the flames into a fierce conflagration."

This statement should be carefully considered since the author many times forgets it in his later arguments. Then follows a consideration of the pioneers of modern socialism in which the work of Babeuf, Saint Simon, Fourier, Owen and others is briefly considered. Very properly too, the chief position is given to

Marx and Engels. In a discussion of these two writers he states in a very fair and accurate form the doctrine of the "Materialistic Interpretation of History" and the "Class Struggle" and Marxian Economics. In every case where possible he gives direct quotations and so far as I have been able to discover, these are not only correctly given, but are the strongest and best selections on the points covered. This is succeeded by a survey of the "Present State of Socialism" in which each country is taken in turn, and a generally accurate and concise summary of the movement is given, the principal emphasis being very properly laid upon Germany for the European movement and upon the American movement because of the national purpose of the present volume. It is interesting, however, to note that he accuses the Socialists of being unjust and tyrannical in attempting to decide Socialist principles by a convention. A Jesuit pleading in the name of science against authoritative declarations is an instructive spectacle! In one place, however, when treating of the German movement he is guilty of deliberate falsification. This is where he declares that the Socialists oppose trade unions and anything tending to improve the conditions of the workers. Since this same error occurs later on we will treat it more fully at that point. In his sketch of the American Labor Movement there is little of which to complain and we cannot but feel he has really landed a small, but nevertheless deserved blow when he declares that "the new platform is eminently a campaign document." On the whole, however, while as we shall see he does sometimes erect straw men, he has not done so in his opening chapter. In his second chapter he proceeds to "an examination of the principal basis of socialism: the materialist conception of history." Here is the point on which Socialists have always been most willing to try issues with the enemy and it is refreshing to find one who meets them on their own ground. That he is fair in his statement of the theory may be seen by the following:

"Their whole theory may be reduced to the following four simple statements:

- "1. There is no dualism of spirit and matter.
- "2. In the social relations and institutions of man there is nothing immutable; everything is subject to a constant process of change.
- "3. In this constant change production and the exchange of products are the determining and decisive factors.
- "4. Social development is effected by the formation of economic contrasts and class struggles."

These are the propositions which he proposes to disprove. If he succeeds in doing this then he will have demolished the socialist philosophy. He takes them up in turn and here is his answer to the first. I quote his entire argument(?) without modification.

"Marx, as well as Engels, Bebel, Liebknecht, etc., never tires of

repeating that man very gradually developed from the brute—in Marx's opinion from the ape. It need not be mentioned that thereby Christianity, its doctrines of paradise, of original sin, of redemption by means of the incarnation and death of Jesus Christ, of heaven and hell, are thrown overboard. Socialist leaders are fully aware of these consequences and make them their own. No occasion is allowed to pass without giving free vent to their hatred of Christianity.

"It cannot be expected of us to refute here all the errors indicated above, together with countless others necessarily connected with them. This would require not merely a treatise on apologetics, but also an entire course of philosophy. Besides, socialists are too self-confident to offer any proofs for their assertions; at most they are content with revamping the stale objections of Feuerbach, Strauss, Darwin, and others of that ilk. We address ourselves to readers who have still some regard for their dignity as human beings."

Surely if ever there was a case of a mountain laboring and producing a mouse this is it. A slur, an assertion, an appeal to religious dogma and prejudice is offered as the only reply which twenty years of theological study can produce. Then he takes up the second postulate that "nothing is immutable,—everything is subject to a constant, never-ending process of change." Here is his reply, "It is plain that such views are the outcome of the grossest materialism * * * Every iota of revealed truth will remain true forever, just as the so-called materialistic conception of history is a pernicious error." Later on, however, he really does proceed to something more like argument. He declares that:

"The negation of eternal and immutable concepts and principles makes knowledge and science impossible and involves hopeless contradictions. It is not satisfied with registering exterior phenomena, it tries to penetrate to and lay bare the hidden causes and governing laws and thence to draw its conclusions; it endeavors to ascend to general and necessary principles. But how can this be done if no general, necessary, and immutable notions exist? If there are no immutable concepts, there is also no intellectual communication between different generations. It is impossible to enter upon the mode of thought of times gone by or to foresee in aught the destinies of future ages. The identity of concepts is completely lacking. How can we know whether Plato or Aristotle have reasoned correctly, how can we at all fathom their meaning, if their concepts and opinions were quite different from ours? In fact, we are completely at a loss to know whether they had ideas and opinions at all, because what we understand by these terms is mayhap a product of modern economic conditions unknown to the ancients. The most gruesome scepticism is the only logical consequence of the 'materialistic conception of history.'"

But is this true? Is it true that science never changes? On the next page he assures us that

"The notion of being, substance, essence, quality, quantity, motion, force, cause, effect, law, necessity, time, eternity, relation, equality, knowledge, cognition, will, evolution, and countless others are the common property of all the sciences, not excluding the mathematical."

But as a matter of fact the notions of "substance," "essence," "motion," "law," "cognition," "will," and "evolution," at least,

of those mentioned, have been subject to tremendous changes within the last generation. Scarcely any one of these terms conveys the same idea in the field of science that it did fifty years ago and this is something of which the author cannot be ignorant. His inconsistency on this point is seen by the fact that in other places, see pages 169 and 243, he takes the Socialists to task because they are consistent and recognize that their own philosophy changes with industrial progress.

The central point of the materialistic conception of history is the one which he includes under his third postulate as follows: "In the process of evolution the economic conditions are the determining and decisive factors." How then does he meet this which he correctly designates as the "very marrow of the materialistic conception of history?" First, by an assertion that Marx and Engels are by it "haplessly involved in flagrant contradictions." Then another assertion that "this postulate has no meaning or value except from the point of downright materialism." Then by an appeal to religious prejudice with the statement that "to him who knows that God has infused into man a spiritual soul" the falsity of the materialistic interpretation of history is evident. Unfortunately there seems to be a large number of people who do not know this fact. Then he admits the truth of the whole statement and concedes that "economic activity will ever be of *paramount* importance in human life." Since this is all that his statement of the materialistic interpretation of history includes we cannot but feel that it constitutes a complete surrender. This is especially true since later on page 139 he declares that "modern inventions" * * * "are the real revolutionaries." But he once more falls back on revelation (?) and declares that "by thought and reflection every human being, however different the economic conditions of each one may be, will arrive at the truth in a life to come," a statement for which, unfortunately, he offers no proof. He follows this up with other reckless assertions. He tells us that "the economic and social life of the Israelitic people was determined and supported entirely by its religious faith." Since practically all modern writers agree on the exact reverse of this, we would think that he would furnish some proof of such a statement—however, no such proof appears. Again he asks us, as if the question were final, that if the economic interpretation of history be true, "how could the Catholic Church, throughout all times and all places, remain essentially the same, in spite of different economic conditions from country to country and from century to century?" Unfortunately for his arguments, that church has not retained any such continuity, as travelers and historians alike can testify, but has varied at all times and places until its adaptability has become proverbial.

And with such arguments as these he seeks to overthrow the hundreds of volumes of carefully collected facts and logical arguments in support of that theory.

But let us proceed to his consideration of the final postulate that "the evolution of history is effected by economic contrasts and class struggles." At last our enemies meet us on the ground of the class struggle and remembering the scholarship and the authoritative character of the work, we should be prepared for heavy attacks. What we do find are simply some more assertions that all human institutions are determined by the standard of natural law. In his attempt at historical refutation he introduces oriental illustrations where there has been no perceptible progress and no class struggles and no great industrial changes and then asks, "Why did not class struggles transform these nations?" Then in order to refute this count in the indictment he makes the statement previously quoted that "modern inventions are the real revolutionaries," but seems to overlook that fact that in so doing he concedes the main premise of which the class struggle is but a corollary.

Having thus disposed of the philosophical foundations of Socialism he proceeds to the economics of Marx. Starting with the labor value theory we are somewhat surprised to find one who has hitherto kept at least some form of intellectual honesty accusing Marx of having overlooked the element of desirability in a commodity as being essential to the possession of value. Although this same objection has been trotted out by every cheap Bourgeois critic of Marx, yet pages could easily be filled with quotations from the first volume of "Capital" showing how utterly dishonest is this argument. Therefore we are justified in accusing the Reverend Cathrein of deliberate lying when he states that "value in use, according to him (Marx) is no factor in the determination of value in exchange." Marx repeats over and over again that only labor which is used in the production of useful things can give exchange value. What he does insist, however, is that this value must be taken for granted as an essential part of all articles of value and the thing which determines their rate of exchange therefore, is not their utility, but the labor power expended upon them. On the whole this portion of the work is simply a rehashing of Boehm-Bawerk's old arguments.

He next considers the doctrine of concentration of industries and presents a mass of German statistics tending to show that the middle class is not decreasing. He seems to forget that on page 23 he has already declared that one of the results of modern industry "was also the great division of society into two hostile classes—a small number of wealthy capitalists and an immense number of laborers" and again on page 230 he tells us that

"Since modern discoveries were made to serve merely the interests of a few capitalists, the solid middle class, which formed the strongest support of the existing social order, began more and more to disappear, and society was divided into two hostile classes—the wealthier bourgeoisie, on the one hand, with their inveterate hatred of the Church and the nobility, with their insatiable avarice and reckless oppression of the laborers as of an inferior race; on the other hand, the huge masses of the poor, particularly laborers in factories, filled with hatred and revenge against their capitalist oppressors."

It might be sufficient to let Jesuit answer Jesuit, but his figures deserve a moment's consideration since they serve to illustrate the tricky character which continually shows through his ostensible fairness. Although he has taken the greatest pains to Americanize his work at all other points he is very careful to use only German statistics here. We have a right to assume that he did this because he knew that the figures concerning American industry would have overthrown his entire argument.

These are the principal points of his argument. For the remainder, so far as a refutation of Socialist doctrines are concerned, his writings consist of mere assertions. For instance he disposes of the army of the unemployed by simply stating that "they exist only in Socialist writings" and he follows this up by repeating the falsehood which we may be sure will be used in this country so long as the present alliance between labor fakirs, capitalists and Socialist critics remain—"that socialists are antagonistic to trade unions." We do not care to enter into his discussion of Socialism and Religion since his idea of both of these terms is different from that of all save his own sect. There is one statement, however, which is worthy of attention. He declares that "Christianity forbids Revolution. That is a violent subversion of the lawfully existing social order." We wonder if there are any who are so utterly ignorant of history as to have never heard of the multitude of times that the Catholic Church has incited to violent revolution against the existing order. Indeed it is not necessary to go into history. France and the clerical question afford us a present illustration, but under this head he has a paragraph which is mightily suggestive.

"Or are, perhaps, the learned and cultured leaders of the social democratic party so simple as to believe that all private owners would freely surrender their possessions to the community, that the Church would freely renounce its institutions and its possessions, that monarchs would freely descend from their thrones, that the nobility would readily sacrifice their inherited rights, and the peasantry abandon the lands tilled by their forefathers?"

So then the church is inciting to violent revolution at the present time. So the Catholic priesthood proposes that should the workers ever decide to stop the robbery of our present

system, it would throw its strength in with the robber barons to overthrow any attempt to secure justice.

Very well, forewarned is fore-armed. The author finds that Socialism is the direct outgrowth of modern liberalism by which he evidently means all of modern scientific thought. With this definition we admit it and are proud of it. His final chapter on "Socialism Impracticable" contains the same old silly straw man that has been set up and blown over by every Socialist killer of the last half century. All the old bogey-men are trotted out and made to do duty again. It is interesting to note that this opponent of gross materialism considers that the only bond that unites man and wife is the necessity of supporting their children. (See page 347). He boldly denounces higher education for the mass of the people and slurs at all general education. When he comes to his conclusions it would seem as if he had somehow become conscious of the weakness of his arguments, for he here descends to deliberate and unscrupulous lying. Judge for instance from the following statement:

"Therefore it is part of the system of orthodox socialists, especially in Germany, to oppose all efforts made for the betterment of the lower classes. It is their policy, as Bebel has worded it, 'to retain the wounds of the body social in festering condition.' In the German parliament most of the legislative measures in favor of the working population were antagonized by socialists under the pretence of their being mere palliatives which would retard the advent of the communist paradise."

When it is remembered that even the Catholic unions have come to look only to the Socialist representatives in the German parliament for legislative relief the disreputable character of such a quotation is evident.

But the heart of the whole business is found in a sentence occurring on almost the last page. "How can the laborer be expected to bear the toils and hardships that are inseparable from his state if he has been led to believe that all hopes and fears in regard to the retribution beyond the grave are childish fancies and with this life all shall come to an end?" In other words the Church is to have as its main function the work of a sort of celestial policeman to keep the workers quiet while they are being skinned. "The wealthy," he tells us, "must bear in mind that they have been appointed by God as it were the administrators of their earthly possessions." This sort of doctrine may have answered very well for the middle ages; it might have served to quiet the protests of chattel slaves, but modern Capitalism demands of its slaves an intelligence incompatible with such doctrines.

So much for the mightiest intellectual battery Capitalism

has been able to erect against Socialism. It is absolutely incapable of harm against those who have a general knowledge of the principles of Socialism, but it may well serve as a foil for the training for Socialist agitators. As such we recommend it to our readers. It is well worthy of examination. It is not difficult to master or to refute. Yet when it is vanquished the intellectual forces of Capitalism will have been routed.

A. M. SIMONS.

Evolution of the Theory of Evolution.

(Continued.)

When astronomy, geography, experimental physics, and physiology were engaged in their first determined attempts to clear away the metaphysical rubbish of the Middle Ages and push human thought once more into its truly evolutionary course, philosophy likewise awoke from its long slumber. For almost 1900 years, the methods of the natural philosopher's have been abandoned. During all that time, the human mind had been wandering aimlessly in the mazes of metaphysical speculation. Revelation, instead of being sought in the open book of nature, had been looked for with up-turned eyes beyond the clouds, in fairy-land.

At last, in 1620, Francis Bacon published his "*Novum Organum*." His plea for new methods of research in the study of nature was a fatal blow to the metaphysical philosophy of Aristotle. By demanding a "new mind" and declaring the human senses the infallible sources of all understanding, Bacon infused new life into the natural philosophy of ancient Greece and pointed human evolution once more into the redeeming course of evolutionary materialism.

However, it cannot be emphasized too strongly, that the idea of evolution, though sporadically scattered through Bacon's philosophy and that of other materialists of the 17th and 18th centuries, had but a spasmodic existence among them, and was frequently not even as clearly expressed as we find it in the works of the Grecian natural philosophers. The historical conditions for an empirical proof of evolution had not yet matured, and the theological influence of those times applied the brake too heavily for a rapid improvement of the ideas of the natural philosophers.

Furthermore, the ancient natural philosophy had been the rallying center of Grecian "democracy." It had been the scientific weapon of progress in the class-struggle between aristocracy and democracy, at a time when theology was not enthroned as an economic ruler, and when religion had at best but a slight hold on men's mind's. The new materialist philosophy, on the other hand, arose at a time when the class-struggles raged fiercely around two religions, and when philosophy did not reach down

into the world of the trading and working classes. Through the influence of the church, Latin had become the language of science, and in consequence the new materialist philosophy came upon the scene, not as a social force, but as a hobby of scholars, a pastime of the select. And it continued to use Latin as its medium of expression for a long time. Indeed, we have not gotten away from this reactionary habit yet, and the fostering of ancient languages in our modern schools still continues to do valiant service in the interest of reaction. It is not until the modern proletariat creates its own science, that the old exclusive and aristocratic mannerisms of feudal and middle class science are abandoned, and the familiar language of the day employed to prepare the mental food for the eager proletarian student.

In the 17th century, and to a great extent also in the 18th and 19th, the exclusive methods and assumptions of aristocratic science were fatal, not alone for the masses, but also for the scientists themselves. So long as science does not pulsate in the throbbing life outside of the study of the scientist, theological or metaphysical speculations permeate the entire fabric of society. In the 17th century, the class-struggles between the two great religions kept the popular mind in a state of continuous excitement so that even kings had to be careful not to exasperate the people in theological matters. Neither Bacon nor the other materialists of the 17th century could get away from this religious atmosphere, and their materialism is, therefore, strongly tainted with theological and metaphysical inconsistencies. As a logical result, materialism did not get very far along on its evolutionary road, and metaphysics retained its sway in science as well as in philosophy. Nevertheless, it is the merit of Bacon to have imparted fresh vigor to the inductive and empirical study of nature.

The men who built on the foundation laid by Bacon, developed his materialism in two different directions. Those who felt attracted by the theistic aphorisms of his doctrine, became the fathers of metaphysical schools of thinkers in England and France. On the other hand, those who felt kin to the materialist essence of Baconian philosophy, continued along this road and thus became the intellectual fathers of the socialist philosophy. Frequently these two tendencies intermingled and produced a hybrid materialist dualism, which was quite as incongruous as the metaphysical materialism of their predecessors.

This imperfect and groping philosophy led to absurd contradictions between the theory and practice of scientists and philosophers. For instance, the logical successor of Bacon, Hobbes, was more pronounced and consistent in his materialism than Bacon, and pushed the human mind forward in the line of evolution toward a more empirical and monistic science. But politi-

cally he was a reactionary of the first water, a defender of royal prerogative and absolutism, a foe of the *puer robustus sed malitiosus* (robust but malicious boy), the "common" people. On the other hand, Hegel, the father of modern idealism and a vigorous opponent of materialism, became the founder of the most revolutionary method of research, the dialectic method, and constructed the fundament of the modern ideas of evolution. This conflict between theory and practice characterizes all scientists and philosophers, with the exception of the founders of scientific socialism and of their socialist disciples. It is a fact, which explains itself out of the historical conditions of proletarian evolution, that the scientific socialists are the only consistent monist materialists of the present day. It is the "irony of fate," which compels the reactionary forces to do evolutionary work against their will and to assist the proletarian scientists, who are conscious evolutionists from necessity, in their historical mission. The most conspicuous example of this historical contradiction between theory and practice is furnished by the churches. Yet they, too, in spite of their reactionary and anti-proletarian practices, have been compelled to level distinctions between classes, nations, and races, and to prepare the ground for a universal evolution toward human brotherhood. The use of Latin in science, to which I have just alluded, illustrates one phase of this leveling process very well. When the proletariat of the Roman empire had been defeated in its evolutionary aims, the Roman church cultivated Latin as an international language. And though it promoted an internationalism of the select few, yet even this gradually served to antagonize the reactionary power of dogmatism, since it was the most relentless foe of theological dogmatism, science, which finally cultivated Latin as an international language. And this science is in our day more and more compelled to ally itself with the class-conscious proletariat. It is a significant fact that all modern languages, which have become more or less world-languages, such as Spanish, French, and English, contain many elements of Latin. And since English is rapidly becoming the international language of the so-called civilized world, the modern proletariat will have little difficulty in assimilating the scant survivals of Latin which are indispensable for an understanding of the technicalities of modern science.

However, in Bacon's time natural philosophy tottered about rather drowsily after 1900 years of sleep, and took but slight notice of the ominous handwriting which capitalist development was slowly but surely tracing on the wall of social institutions. So much more briskly did economic evolution proceed on its course, sowing the seeds of future revolutions, which would in due time clear the field for a more scientific and evolutionary materialism. For instance, when cotton-planting was introduced

in Virginia, one year after the publication of Bacon's "*Novum Organum*," the germs were scattered for the Civil War, that was destined to shake the foundations of the future North-American republic, 245 years later, and to sound the tocsin for a proletarian movement, which would some day reap the mature fruits of materialist science.

At the same time, inventors began to cast about for means of increasing the productivity of labor, and natural science gathered more empirical material for its special departments.

Early in the 17th century, De Caus, a French engineer, had invented a machine by which a column of water could be elevated by the pressure of steam confined in a vessel above the water. In 1629, Branca, an Italian inventor, contrived a plan for working several mills by a blast of steam against the vanes. In 1639, the transit of Venus across the orb of the sun was for the first time observed by Horrox. The barometer was invented by Torricelli in 1642. The marquis of Worchester described, in his "Century of Inventions," 1663, an apparatus for raising water by the expansive force of steam. Two years later, Isaac Newton published his first improved methods of astronomical calculation. In 1669, Brandt discovered phosphorus. Roemer ascertained the velocity of light in 1675. Leibniz published his invention of the differential calculus in 1684. And in 1687, Newton came forth with his "*Principia*," enunciating the laws of gravity. Denis Papin, a native of France and professor at the university of Marburg, Germany, conceived the idea, in 1688, of obtaining motive power by means of a piston working in a cylinder, through a sudden condensation of steam by cold. In 1698, Captain Savery, an Englishman, obtained a patent for the first actual working steam engine to be used in raising water. And in 1705, Thomas Newcomen, a blacksmith, and John Cawley, a plumber, patented an atmospheric engine, in which condensation was effected by pouring cold water upon the external surface of a cylinder.

These pioneer efforts in the construction of steam engines were not to be crowned with success until June 5, 1769, when James Watt obtained his first patent for an automatic steam engine. So far as the philosophy of the 17th century was concerned, these industrial and scientific advances made little impression on it. When in 1641, Descartes (Cartesius) published his "*Meditationes de Prima Philosophia*," he showed himself to be still completely in the thrall of metaphysics. He contended that man alone had a true "soul," with sensation and free will, and that animals were mere automata, without will or sensibility. At the same time, he suffered from the traditional contradictions of men of his turn of mind. While in his philosophy, he attributed a dualist and supernatural soul to man, he endowed, in his physics,

matter with self-creating power and regarded mechanical motion as its life's function.

A valiant antagonist arose against the Cartesian metaphysics in the person of Hobbes. He published, in 1642, his "*Elementa Philosophica de Cive*," and fortified the materialist position in this and other works considerably. By asserting that it is impossible to separate thought from matter that thinks, he did not only strike the Cartesian metaphysics heavily, but also shattered the theistic survivals of Baconian materialism. However, the historical conditions did not enable him to furnish the proof for Bacon's fundamental principle that all human understanding arises from the world of sensations. On the other hand, he was the first of the modern natural philosophers to make a clear distinction between the natural and social environment and to realize that social activity is a part of the general activity of the universe. In his "*Leviathan*," published in 1651, he says: "The register of knowledge of fact is called history. Whereof there be two sorts, one called natural history, which is the history of such facts or effects of nature as have no dependence on man's will, such as the histories of metals, plants, animals, regions, and the like. The other is civil history, which is the history of the voluntary actions of men in commonwealths." The modern monist will find much to criticise in these definitions, but they mark nevertheless an advance in the evolution of thought as compared to the ideas of his predecessors and contemporaries.

In Leibniz and Spinoza, Descartes found allies who contribute much toward the prolongation of the life of metaphysics, and theistic idealism had an eloquent spokesman in Berkeley. Even a man of Newton's mathematical mind remained a lifelong captive of dualistic ideas and his conception of the solar system was of the crude kind which speculated about the causes of the "first impulse" for the motion of the planets. Still his ideas seemed so dangerous to the theological dualists that for instance Leibniz denounced the Newtonian theory of gravitation, because it undermined natural religion and denied revealed religion. The theistic ideas owed a continued existence to the influence of Rousseau and Voltaire, though especially the last-named was a scoffer at all religions based on supernatural revelation.

But materialism remained close on the trail of metaphysics. In France, Descartes was personally confronted by Gassendi, who revived Epicurean materialism and accomplished for materialism in France what Hobbes did in England. And Pierre Bayle prepared the way for a more mature philosophy in France by a cutting criticism of Cartesian metaphysics. Driven by religious doubts to a closer study of metaphysics, Bayle wrote the history of metaphysics only to give dualism a blow from which it would never fully recover.

After this destructive work of materialistic criticism, Locke appeared as a constructive materialist, in 1690, with his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding," which was enthusiastically received by all friends of enlightenment, especially in France. He furnished the first philosophical proofs of the fact that all human ideas are due to the functions of the senses, and thus completed Baconian materialism which Hobbes had systematized.

Locke's work came at a time when metaphysics had gradually lost its touch with the sciences that had once given it a certain authority. While mathematics, physics, zoology, astronomy, chemistry, and other exact sciences, made themselves more and more independent, metaphysics retained nothing but speculations and a mystical belief in celestial things. But when the last great metaphysicians of the 17th century, Malebranche and Arnauld, died, worldly affairs were beginning to absorb public interest to the exclusion of supernatural speculations. To the same extent did materialism gain favor among Frenchmen.

With the beginning of the 18th century, we see the French champions of enlightenment engaged in open war against metaphysics, theology, and the existing political institutions. In the interest of "reason," all hitherto existing ideas and institutions had to be submitted to the most ruthless criticism, and this "reason" was nothing else but the dictates of the class-interests of the French bourgeoisie. In England on the other hand, the bourgeois revolution had at that time found its temporary armistice in the compromise of 1689, which left the great land-owners in possession of the spoils of political office, while it at the same time safeguarded the economic interests of the rising bourgeoisie sufficiently for the time being. The English bourgeois, was, therefore, as much interested as the nobility in maintaining the influence of religion "for the people," meaning for the exploitation of the working class, while the French bourgeois was compelled, by the requirements of the historical situation in France, to stir the working class to the highest pitch of revolutionary activity against the feudal nobility.

Materialism, therefore, in the 18th century, took up its abode in France. Once more the irony of fate would have it that the metaphysicians had to furnish the weapons for their own undoing. For French materialism developed two schools, and one of them took its departure from the physics of the metaphysician Descartes. The other school started out from Locke, and led directly to Socialism. Cartesian materialism became the father of that mechanical materialism which characterizes the bourgeois materialists of the 18th and 19th centuries, who were either ignorant of evolutionary materialism, or opposed to it. It furnished at first the basis for the natural science of France, and, combined with theistic idealism, it became the stronghold of those who, like

Cuvier and Agassiz, clung to the Mosaic idea of creation and to the theory of fixed species, in opposition to the introduction of the idea of development by the interaction of physical and chemical movements. The followers of Locke, on the other hand, cultivated the evolutionary branch of French materialism.

"The immediate disciple and French interpreter of Locke, Condillac, directed the point of Locke's sensationalism at once against the metaphysics of the 17th century," writes Karl Marx in the "Holy Family," in which he and Frederick Engels exposed the shallowness of the Young-Hegelians of the Bruno Bauer stripe. "He proved that the French justly rejected metaphysics, because it was merely a handiwork of imagination and theological prejudices. He published a refutation of the systems of Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, and Malebranche. In his work '*L'essai sur l'Origine des Connaissances Humaines*,' he elaborated the ideas of Locke and proved that not only the soul, but also the senses, not only the art of producing ideas, but also the art of sense-perceptions, was a matter of experience and habit. The entire development of man therefore depends on education and external circumstances. . . . From Helvetius, who likewise takes his departure from Locke, materialism received its specific French character. He also takes into consideration the social life, in his work "*De L'Homme*." The senses and self-love, enjoyment and a well understood personal interest, are the basis of all morality. The natural equality of human intelligences, the identity of the progress of reason and the progress of industry, the natural goodness of man, the omnipotence of education, are the main points of his system.

A combination of Cartesian and English materialism is found in the writings of Lamettrie. He utilized the physics of Descartes to their minutest details. His machine-man is an elaboration of the Cartesian machine-animal. In the "*Système de la Nature*" of Holbach, the physical part consists likewise of a combination of French and English materialism, while the ethical part is based principally on the ethics of Helvetius."

The universality of the French materialists has a lasting monument in the "*Encyclopédie*," which was begun by Diderot and D'Alembert in 1751, and in which Robinet, Buffon, Holbach, Condillac, Lamettrie, Helvetius and Grimm collaborated.

The French encyclopedists offer a fair standard by which to judge the scientific position of their age. Science was still in its rudimentary stage, and this corresponded to the control of tools and technique in keeping with the prevailing mode of production. The two epoch-making works on natural history typical for this period are the "*Systema Naturae*," published by Linnaeus in 1735, and the "*Histoire Naturelle*," published by Buffon in 1749. Franklin made his successful experiments demonstrating the connec-

tion between electricity and lightning in 1752. But neither his work, nor the invention of the spinning-jenny by Hargreaves in 1767, and the perfection of the spinning frame by Arkwright in 1769, produced any immediate effect on the ideas of scientific explorers. Cook was making his first voyage around the world, about this time (1768), and Priestley discovered oxygen in 1774, without, however, knowing what he had discovered.

The philosophical work, which followed in England immediately after Locke's "Essay," was Hume's "Treatise of Human Nature," published in 1739. It cannot be regarded as an advance beyond Locke, nor is it superior to the work of the French materialists. Hume was a better historian than philosopher, but even as a historian he fell far below Vice, who in the beginning of the 18th century had made an attempt to substitute for the theological conception of history a method which regarded historical events as the fulfillment of natural laws. Nor was Hume the equal of Gibbon, who, in 1776, published his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," in which faint traces of an evolutionary conception of history appear. On the other hand, Rousseau's "*Contrat Social*," published in 1762, was but a feeble attempt to explain the origin of human societies, without the slightest recognition of the basic factors of social evolution.

A brighter light falls upon this historical period from the department of mathematics, criminology, and economies. In mathematics, the idea of continuity led to the introduction of evolutionary ideas into natural science. Buffon, who had entered the French Academy as a geometrician, introduced the continuity-idea into his "*Histoire Naturelle*," and this idea became the spark, which, in the hands of Lamarck, later on started the fire of organic development in all natural sciences.

In criminology, Beccaria made a new departure in Italy, in 1774. He published his work on crime and punishment under a false date and with a false place of publication, knowing that his ideas, which were impregnated with the spirit of the impending French Revolution, would set loose a storm of reactionary attacks against him. He opposed the medieval methods of "justice," with their torture and secret proceedings, and undermined the conception of a personal responsibility of criminals. This threatened the dearest tenets of theological dogmas about "vicarious atonement," and set the jesuitical machine of the church into frenzied motion.

In economics, the year 1776 marks a milestone of advance in Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," which subverted the current ideas on the origin of profits. Smith declared in so many words, that profits were not an arbitrary addition of the seller to the price of his article, but surplus-values, surplus-products, appropriated by the owners of means of production out of the unpaid

products of "industrious persons." This conception became the basis for Ricardo's law of value, which, in the hands of Marx, was transformed into the revolutionary analysis of capitalist production, out of which the modern socialist movement developed its life.

Generally speaking, there was as yet no clear perception of the evolutionary nature of social and natural processes, neither in the writings of the sociologists, nor in those of the scientists and philosophers. While Buffon showed at least a faint trace of continuous development in his work. Linnaeus regarded his system of plants and animals avowedly as a mere diagrammatic classification, without the least suggestion of any natural connection between the various classes of animals and plants. And even when he elaborated the first outlines for a natural system of classification, he still had the idea of fixed and created species in mind.

But already the fiery glow of the bourgeois revolution in the American colonies was reddening the western horizon, and its sparks were soon to ignite the dry feudal structures in France. The Declaration of Independence asserted that "all men were born equal," but the writers of this document and their class forgot to apply this "truth" to the slaves, indentured servants, debtors, and propertyless colonists who were debarred from voting. Nevertheless, this document marked at least the awakening consciousness of the "Rights of Man" and the "Age of Reason," that is to say, the consciousness of the rising capitalist class that they had their own peculiar idea of right and reason, as opposed to the feudal powers. With the American and French Revolutions, the capitalist class established a precedent in social evolution by means of revolution, which is still of too recent date to be easily forgotten, and which the modern proletariat will some day follow with good effect.

ERNEST UNTERMANN.

(To Be Continued.)

To the Russian Revolution.

Ye disinherited, that mourn
In misery, abject, forlorn,*
Your crime that you were born
 In poverty,
God speed the day when ye shall spurn
 The ancient lie—

That some should loll in idle ease
Lulled in the lap of luxuries,
While those that toil must starve and freeze,
 And be pacified
With what their lordly masters please
 To cast aside.

Alas, that there should be such dearth
Of reverence for humble worth,
While bastard, gold-got pride of birth
 Holds high her head,
And scorns the tillers of the earth
 That make her bread!

Alas, that honest men should need!
Alas, that helpless women plead!
Alas, that tender children bleed
 In our own time!
Shame! shame on those whose social creed
 Condone the crime!

God speed the day when right shall reign,
When slaves shall cease to kneel in vain,
But rise and snap the tyrant's chain,
 And take their place
Full owners of their own again—
 An unbound race.

The day will come, (God grant it soon!)
When each shall have his birth-right boon
To make and take what is his own—
 His rightful share,
And none shall reap that hath not sown,
 And tilled with care.

The day has come. Up, brothers, on!
The long, dark hours of night are gone,
In the trembling east the blood-hued dawn
 Paints red the skies.
Arise, and strike the tyrant down!
 Arise! arise!

The day has come—the destined day
For which your exiled comrades pray,
Who in Siberian dungeons lay—
 Cold, dark and wet.
The day has come when blood shall pay
 The tyrant's debt.

The aching ages bid you rise,
Your comrades under other skies
Have fixed on you their eager eyes.
 Up, men, and do!
The future ages' destinies
 Depend on you!

The world-old lethargy has fled,
And Liberty long centuries dead
For which your sires and grandsires bled,
 Must live again
Though Russia's rivers all run red
 To the crimsoned main.

WALTHER V. HOLLOWAY.

Berkeley, California.

Conditions in Mexico.

CAPITALISM has today grown to such proportions that no portion of the civilized world is exempt from its power and influence, and since we know that it will be superseded by some kind of a co-operative system it behooves socialists to consider and study the march of events, even in such a backward and undeveloped country as Mexico. American capitalists seem to have left Mexico till the last because they knew it was at hand and would "keep," but the flood of capitalism is now coming in a mighty wave. The railroads, mines, coal, oil, and asphalt deposits, along with large agricultural interests, are already in the hands of foreign capitalists, mostly Americans. Even the cereal breakfast foods so familiar to American eyes are beginning to decorate the dead walls and show-windows of old Mexico and are offered for sale at 50 cents per package with guarantees to cure all the ailments to which mankind is subject. Up to the present, however, the natives seem to prefer the old time tortilla. Some of the more intelligent Mexicans are beginning to grasp the meaning of this introduction of foreign capital and expect it to be followed by a flood of immigration from the United States.

The government continues to dole out the national resources of the country to foreign money-bags while Mexican workers grovel in filth, disease and ignorance, for lack of access to these same resources. Of what value is the free press to an illiterate, and a free school to a pauper? Free speech is guaranteed by the Mexican constitution, but it is a dead letter.

If socialists wish to reach these people it must be done through secret organizations and underground publications. One thing is hopeful and that is, that however ignorant the working classes are they do not harbor any illusions concerning the identity of their interest with those of their employers. On this point at least the most ignorant peon seems to be rather in advance of the average American trades unionist.

In the city of Mexico the workers are beginning to organize mutual aid societies which in some ways resemble our trades unions. In Guadalajara an attempt was made to organize the workers. A meeting was called in a theatre building for this purpose, but was dispersed by the police.

Wages are far below what is necessary to provide anything like a decent living. Servant girls working from fifteen to sixteen hours a day receive \$4.00 or \$5.00 a month, and sleep on the kitchen floor or under the stairway. It is scarcely sur-

prising to learn that they are not all strictly virtuous or absolutely temperate with liquor selling at from 2 to 5 cents per glass, while the necessities of life have gone up almost as fast as in the United States. The working day for tailors and shoemakers is only limited by their power to keep awake, and the same is true of women who make stockings, shawls or fancywork. Many of the latter go blind and become beggars or street peddlers. I have been in tenement houses here where each family lives in one room about ten feet square with one door and no window.

The men of this class spend a goodly portion of their time in jail. They are strictly proletarian, having no property but their labor power and when arrested for petty offences must always pay their fine by laboring within prison walls. The usual penalty for drunkenness is eight days and during their incarceration their wives and children must hustle for themselves.

A servant suddenly left the house where I am stopping the other day and I learned that her husband had just got out of jail and she was going home to celebrate the occasion. She knew she could be with him only at intervals while she could work "any old time." The difference between her earnings and *no* earnings was very little anyhow.

The church in Mexico has lost its old time vigor but the corpse still hangs as a dead weight around the neck of society, stifling all intelligent thought and rational political activity. The breaking of its power is largely due to Benito Juarez. He was a man of the people, in whose veins flowed none of the blood of the despotic Spaniard, but like Lincoln, he could not control the action of his successors, and the Mexican today suffers under a new form of despotism as effective as was the church in the days of yore.

Some idea of how barbaric and brutal this oppression is may be gained by the fact that if the manuscript of this article should have been found in my possession my career in this country would have ended suddenly. Capacious prisons of solid stone await to receive any one who dares to speak or write a word of opposition to the governing power.

Corruption runs rampant in every branch of the government. On three different occasions I have seen a clerk in a Mexican post-office of the first class attempt to "short change" a patron securing a money order. On the whole I have never seen so many artless thieves and cheerful liars as infest this ultra-christian country.

The Republican form of government is a farce and it is easily possible that this may remain one of the strongholds of capitalism. Plutocracy may intrench itself behind this mass of human ignorance to await the final fray.

The industrial development of the United States and Mexico

is so closely allied that the socialist movements of the two countries must necessarily have much in common. If there are any socialists in Mexico we should get into communication and see what can be done toward organization. There are, no doubt, many American and European socialists in Mexico and if any of them should see this article I hope they will write to the REVIEW and make themselves known. An isolated socialist unidentified with the party in any country is of but little use to the movement. The time will come when the capitalists will use all the backward races of the people against the more civilized ones and it behooves us to organize as far as possible against the coming of that time. The reference that James Burton Adams, of the Denver Post, made concerning one-half the Russians is applicable to a large portion of Mexican people, "they are unable to read and write, but they can feed and fight" and that is all that "will be expected of them."

The above article is from an American socialist now residing in Mexico. He is known to us and we can vouch for his sincerity. If this should meet the eye of anyone who can assist in such an organization of the Mexican Socialists as he proposes and they will communicate with us we will be glad to co-operate.—EDITOR.

Gapon and Socialist Unity

The "Iskra"—Spark, official organ of the Russian Social Democratic Labor party, in its issue of March 25th, contains a communication of Karl Kautsky published in No. 73 of *Leipziger Volkszeitung*. It throws an interesting sidelight on many important phases of the international movement and, I think, deserves space and comment in the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. Kautsky writes:

The last issue of the *Vorwaerts* contains an appeal of Pope Gapon, published in the International Secretariat of Brussels, in which Gapon invites all Socialist organizations of Russia to unite. It requires all the naivete, which Gapon managed in manifesting up to the present time, that a man, who himself learned something about Socialism only a few weeks ago, should undertake the task of unity. But I think that the International Secretariat, which strangely enough appropriated to itself the name of the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau, is decidedly exceeding the limits of its powers when it is constituting itself into a herald of Gapon.

Nothing is easier then expressing desires of unity. This can be done without the least knowledge of the state of affairs, but in order that the attempt of unity may attain its object, the first condition must be the creation of a basis upon which unity may take place, and this, in its turn, presupposes the most exact knowledge of the differences, their causes, as well as of the policy which may be really necessary. The International Secretariat points to the unity of the French comrades, but this would have been impossible, had the Amsterdam Congress merely confined itself to the expression of a desire for unity, and not laid down, in its resolution, the real basis for the same. Gapon is utterly unable to offer such a basis for the unity of the Russian organizations, no more than the International Secretariat is.

These appeals may have one effect only—to mislead comrades, who stand far from Russian relations, as to the nature of the differences among the Russian Socialist parties, differences which are partly already overcome, and partly, in so far as they are of a deeper nature, did not and do not prevent them nevertheless from marching side by side in common struggle.

The *Vorwaerts* reprints the communication of the Interna-

tional Secretariat, without expressing its own opinion. It brings however a quotation from the organ of the Socialist Revolutionary party, from which it appears that the latter is always ready to unite.

Such a reference may have one object only—to make *other* Socialist organizations—the Social Democratic ones—appear as preventing this unity. The *Vorwaerts* remains thus faithful to its old views—or, in order to be unjust to no one, views of some of its editors, from whose point of view in all differences among Socialists, the Marxists appear always as the disturbers of peace.

K. KAUTSKY.

To this note, Kautsky adds the following remarks :

“This note was sent by me to the *Vorwaerts*, but the editor refused to print it. I mention this not as a complaint against the editorial office of the *Vorwaerts*, whose good faith I have no reason to doubt, but in order to anticipate the question why I did not publish my criticism in the *Vorwaerts* itself. I cannot, however, understand the reason for the refusal. The editor holds that—it would have been unjust to the International Bureau, of which you are a member, to publish your complaint in the *Vorwaerts*, before a preliminary attempt has been made to submit it directly to the committee.’ Besides the fact that I am the secretary only of the German members of the Bureau, and not a member of the Bureau itself, I have directed my remarks not against the International Bureau, but against the International Secretariat, which has published the appeal of Gapon, without notifying the Bureau. The members of the Bureau owe the Secretariat no more respect than the Secretariat owes them. I would have, however, waited for the next session of the International Bureau (probably in April, 1906), in order to submit to it my complaint, if the formal question of jurisdiction only would have been involved. My main object was not at all to question the jurisdiction of the International Secretariat, but a desire to prevent that the appeal to Gapon with the quotations brought by the *Vorwaerts* may be used to the detriment of the Russian Social Democracy, by creating a prejudice against it. This could suffer no delay and must be discussed publicly. I have read before the appeal of Gapon, published by the International Secretariat, but did not deem it necessary to protest against it. Owing, however, to the addition of the *Vorwaerts*, it has acquired the character of something directed against the Russian Social Democracy and there was reason to fear that, if allowed to pass without contradiction, it could have been used by the opponents of our Russian comrades, as were other remarks of the *Vorwaerts*, as the opinion of the German Social Democracy. Therefore I took the

pen, in the interests of Russian Social Democracy, and deemed it essential, that my brief contradiction should appear as soon as possible, before the remarks of the *Vorwaerts* could have found their way into the Russian Socialist press. For the same reason I decline to enter into further discussion with the *Vorwaerts* and to bring into motion its *Presskommission* apparatus. I am too busy to devote without necessity too much time to such discussion. Furthermore, by publishing my remarks in the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* I attain without delay my aim: to defend the Russian Social Democracy from an unjust reproach that, in the present important moment, it splits, with a light mind, the phalanx of Russian fighters for freedom and thus fails in the fulfillment of its duty in the great struggle for freedom, which takes place now for a new Russia." K. K.

Translated by

HENRY L. SLOBODIN.

History of Education in the United States.*

EDUCATION like everything else in the United States has been subject to continuous and quite rapid evolution. During Colonial times there was a sharp differentiation geographically which indeed continues to a large extent to the present time. The new England colonies were made up quite largely of highly educated men, in fact it is probable that in very few communities in the history of the world was the proportion of college bred men much higher than in the Massachusetts and Connecticut colonies. It was therefore but natural that the subject of education should early receive attention and before the close of colonial times there was something quite approaching an educational system throughout the northern colonies. This, however, only extended to the privileged classes. No effort was made to reach "indented servants" or wage workers. In fact the system was much stronger at the top than at the bottom. There were several quite respectable colleges and universities before there was anything approaching a general system of education.

The most striking feature, however, of American educational development is to be found in what is designated by this author as the educational revival. He points to the fact that during the first quarter of the 19th century, "The schools were running down. It is true that colleges were springing up and that academies were in their most prosperous condition, but neither of these institutions was for the people." About 1836 or '37 in the midst of economic depression there began a great educational revival, which reached from New England westward to Ohio, and which laid the foundation of our present educational system. But little attempt is made to account for this by the writer, and indeed the only reason which he does give for it was the "one man reason" the presence of Horace Mann.

If we turn, however, to the industrial situation of that time we find that something was taking place of which the author of this book seems to be wholly ignorant, and for which he is not to be entirely blamed, as he but shares this ignorance with practically all other historians. The industrial revolution in America had just closed, so far, at least, as the cotton and woolen industry

*HISTORY OF EDUCATION IN UNITED STATES, by Edwin Grant Dexter. The Macmillan Co., Cloth, 636 pp., \$2.00.

was concerned. Capitalism was getting its first foot hold. This had produced its essential product, a labor movement. It is significant that one of the most striking characteristics of the labor movement of this time was its insistent demand for increasing facilities of education for the working class. The following quotation from the resolutions adopted at a meeting of the organized workers held in New York in November, 1829, shows this:

"Resolved that the most grievous species of inequality is that produced by inequality in education and that a national system of education and guardianship which shall furnish to all children of the land equal food, clothing and instruction at the public expense, is the only essential remedy for injustice."

"Resolved that we unite our efforts and our votes to carry through our state legislature the great regenerating measure of a national education, which shall secure equally to every child which is born into the republic, a complete and systematic course of instruction, including the knowledge of at least one trade or useful education and a comfortable independence during that course of instruction at public expense."

"Resolved that all other modes of reform are, compared to this, particular, inefficient, or trifling."

"Resolved that next to life and liberty we consider education the greatest blessing bestowed upon mankind."

"Resolved that the public funds should be appropriated (to a reasonable extent) to the progress of education upon a regular system that shall insure the opportunity to every individual of obtaining a competent education before he shall have arrived at the age of maturity."

These resolutions are but a few of those adopted by working men's bodies at this time, and the labor papers are constantly filled with calls for greater activity in public education. Anyone who examines these platforms appearing almost ten years before the educational revival and who realizes the extent and importance of this movement, cannot but be convinced that it was the most important cause of the "educational revival."

Since that time elementary education has gone through many changes. In the decades immediately following the Civil war it reflected with marvelous accuracy the capitalist system amid which it lived. It was as mechanical in its operation, as standardized in its production as any factory. In later years it has begun to reflect to some degree the rising working class movement, in favor of greater freedom. This is expressed in the introduction of manual training, nature study, and especially in the kindergarten movement. Here again the author gives only the facts and sees nothing of the causes.

In secondary education the same evolution is taking place. His chapter on "Development of School Organization and Administration" traces the rise of the district system, shows its imperfections and its gradual tendency towards centralization in town, county and state control.

Text books also have gone through a most striking evolution.

The day when the "horn book," the primer, the spelling book, and the Bible constituted the complete literary equipment of whole educational systems is a wonderful contrast to the present time when, in quantity, at least, there is nothing to complain of and the quality is improving with rapid steps in spite of book trusts, and other capitalist influences of a more indirect and subtle character.

The chapter on "Higher and Special Education" traces with encyclopediac detail, and so far as we can discover with general accuracy, the growth of colleges and universities until the present time, when there are something over 10,000 students in the higher educational institutions. Here, too, there has been a tremendous change in the character of the instruction. Science and the elective system have gained the upper hand in the struggle with the dead languages and a pre-determined course.

It is interesting to note that theological students are decreasing in numbers in spite of the tremendous increase in every other department. One cannot but remark at the waste expressed by the fact that something over 14,000 men are engaged in the study of law at the present time.

In technical and agricultural education there has been the most striking growth. Here is something in which modern commercialism is directly interested, and we are not surprised to note that the number of students, the amount of endowment and the size of the institutions in general is increasing by leaps and bounds. In the last few years commercial education also has taken on a new form. Private commercial schools, or business colleges as they are commonly called, have increased in number from 26 with 5,824 pupils in 1870, to 407 with 110,031 pupils in 1901. The commercial courses are now being introduced into the public schools quite extensively. Here, too, it is all too evident what interests are giving this bias to our educational systems.

At this point the influences are so evident that they have even attracted the attention of the author, who has hitherto been completely blind to the effect of industrial conditions. He notes that,

"The most recent move in commercial education and the most hopeful one, since it aims to produce leaders rather than mere journeymen, is that which is just now taking place in our higher academic institutions. Economic development is in the direction of great business enterprises, the success or failure of which depends upon the good judgment and far sightedness of their leaders, and not their expertness as book-keepers. In recognition of this, our colleges and universities have set themselves to the task of graduating men of power, the basis of whose education is commercial, rather than classical or technically scientific."

This movement is now apparently just entering upon its beginning and in the last five years has spread with most striking rapidity.

The education of women is also something of modern times, reflecting again the entrance of women into the world of industry. The first college for women, which still exists, was established in 1859, but this movement finds its real beginning in the decade from 1870 to '80. The co-educational movement began about the same time and finds its greatest expression in the state universities.

The negro, Indian, and the defective classes in society have also had developed for them special educational facilities. Those for the negro have been so frequently discussed as to need little attention here, beyond noticing the fact that they too correspond to the needs of capitalism for skilled unclass-conscious workers.

The library movement, very properly treated as a part of educational history is on its popular side at least, is little more than a generation old. The whole tendency here, under the influence of the new forces of democracy, is in the direction of extending ever more and more facilities to readers. When libraries were first formed it has been sarcastically said that the librarian considered it his principal function to defend the books against the attacks of possible readers, and some of this spirit undoubtedly remains. At the present time, however, the greatest problem before all librarians making any pretense of being abreast of the times is that of attaining the greatest use for the books.

Newspapers and periodicals are treated in a valuable brief summary, as are also summer schools, learned societies and associations and lyceums, popular lectures and museums. Here again he gives not credit to the influence of the labor movement discussed above in the extension of the great American Lyceum movement, which was contemporaneous with the "educational revival". Yet an examination of the proceedings of labor organizations of this time will show that they were enthusiastically supporting this idea before it had gained anything like its great popularity of later years.

As a reference book in compact easily accessible form and well classified as to matter this work occupies a peculiarly valuable field. It is a storehouse which must be used by whoever wishes to know the facts of educational institutions in America.

A. M. SIMONS.

The Nature of Capital.

With each passing year the question of wealth distribution assumes a more aggravated phase. Under a system which leaves all to chance or the interacting play of personal greeds, inequality in wealth progressively increases until it is evident to the most indifferent that the possible limit of inequality is not far off. Such justification of this condition as is attempted by conservative economists, finds the criteria of distribution inherent in the productive process itself, and in this they are followed by the various radical schools except certain utopians who would give to each according to his needs. But when the process of production is subjected to analysis, the utmost dissension prevails, not so much over the facts discovered, as over their ethical significance, the question of the proper distribution of wealth being at bottom of an ethical tenor. The facts are in the main not difficult. Land, labor and capital are the productive factors. The raw material, the subject-matter of industry, is furnished by land. Labor is the human exertion which molds it to human needs. Capital alone is an illusive and protean conception, concerning which no two theorists agree, and which each one defines only to unconsciously abandon his definition within a few pages.

One thing is clear and uniformly conceded—that capital is primarily a product of land and labor, and is therefore a form of wealth, using the latter term as descriptive of the entire fruit of industry. Another thing should be fairly evident—that if capital is to furnish a criterion of distribution, that is, the basis of a claim to wealth, it must be because it has a certain productive potency, so that by its use more wealth is created than could be without it. Examining, now, the various economic categories of wealth, such as goods in process of production, goods ready for consumption, etc., it does not take much reflection to show that the only form of wealth which, divorced from contractual obligations, possesses a productive potency is the implements or tools with which men aid their labors. Whatever strange forms these implements may take, whether the stone hatchet of the aborigines, the packing house of a beef trust, the milk cow of the dairymen, or the show cases of the merchant, it is to them alone, of all the forms of wealth, that a productive efficiency can be attributed, or a portion of the products of industry credited. In defiance, therefore, of

popular usage, it is necessary to exclude from the economic conception of capital, the mere subject-matter of industry, such as raw material, merchants' stocks, etc., as also money paid in wages, and of course paper evidences of indebtedness, such as notes, bonds, and the like. Capital and the tools of industry are one and the same.

As a form of wealth, and as proceeding from land and labor, capital must partake of the characteristics of its origin, must, indeed, embody the sources from which it sprang. It is, accordingly, trite to speak of capital as "stored up labor," though it is a juster estimate to recognize in it a material substance, drawn from the land, and molded by labor to man's use. This description holds good even where, as in the case of domestic animals, vital forces, springing from nature, have been directed by man to his own ends. Indeed, this is one of the services of capital, that it enables man to harness natural forces for his use, as the furnace in which coal is burned beneath a boiler; and as the coal in which the force is dormant is also wealth, and as an agent in production, it, too, is capital. A part of the productive potency which resides in capital is therefore referable to the natural forces which, as a heritage from its mother, the earth, lie hidden within it. But there are implements of toil, mere tools, which embody no force in themselves, and yet have a productive potency since by their aid wealth is increased. The productive potency of these tools consists in the qualities of the material substances from which they are fashioned, the hardness of steel, the electric conductivity of copper, etc., and in the mechanical principles on which they are constructed, the wedge, screw, lever, etc. So that in a general way it may be said that the productive potency which resides in capital is due, first, to the forces of nature, second, to the qualities of matter, third, to the principles of mechanics; or, as Professor J. B. Clark tersely says: "The laws of matter, in short, make capital productive." (*Distribution of Wealth*, p. 135.)

All this seems simple enough, and yet it is a premise of the most crucial importance. However, before any conclusions are drawn from it, the idea that capital is "stored up labor" should be further examined. The labor of creating the implements of industry falls into two classes, that of invention, and that of actual construction. All capital embodies at least the latter. But the labor of creation, which is said to be stored up in capital, has nothing whatever to do with its productive potency. This is apparent when it is remembered that axes, horses or dynamite which fell from heaven or were called into being by a fairy's wand, would be just as serviceable and just as efficient aids to labor as if manufactured or molded by the hand of man. Yet while "stored up labor" does not account for the productive efficacy of capital,

the idea it expresses cannot be cavalierly dismissed. Labor is the one source of wealth which is universally conceded to be personal and private possession, and therefore indubitably capable of conferring an individual title to property, or, in other words, of furnishing an unassailable criterion for the distribution of wealth. And the tools which labor creates are, therefore, private property. For the orthodox economist, title to them vests conjointly in laborer, landlord and, if a prior capital has been employed, in the capitalist. For the single-taxer, in laborer and capitalist. For the socialist, in the laborer alone. But in any event, and for all schools, the implements of industry are susceptible of private ownership. This much the "stored up labor" in them assures.

In this ethical susceptibility to private ownership, capital, according to the radical schools, differs from land, which is not created by any man's labor, but comes, a divine donation, to every creature by virtue of the mere fact of his existence upon the earth. Land is, morally, the common property of all. The effect of this is to deprive land of any function as a criterion of distribution, and to deny that its fruitfulness can furnish the basis of a private claim to any portion of wealth. The productive potency of land belongs *pro tempore* to the first appropriator, that is, to the laborer himself, and that portion of the product which is imputable to land is thus distributed not according to its theoretic genesis but according to the labor performed. In other words, access to land should be free to all and each should receive the whole product he may reap therefrom free from any claim to participation by the idle landlord. Private ownership of land and the exaction of rent to which it gives rise are morally indefensible, notwithstanding the conceded fact that land is a source of wealth. Such is the position of both single-taxers and socialists, to which, indeed, there seems no adequate answer.

The case of capital is not so clear. It may be stated in this way: An instrument of production, itself created by labor and hence the rightful property of its artificer, possesses a productive potency which is not, however, due to the labor of its manufacture, but is ascribable to natural qualities, principles and forces which it embodies. When employed in production, this instrument, by virtue of these qualities, principles and forces, will so assist the process that some portion of the product may fairly be ascribed to its use. How is this portion, which following the usage of economists, may be styled "interest," to be distributed? The answer of the orthodox economist is simple and positive: it goes to the owner of the instrument, the capitalist. In this answer the single taxer acquiesces. The socialist alone demurs.

In the first place, it seems entirely clear that the capitalist is entitled to have his property preserved to him unimpaired, and if

its use has resulted in damage or deterioration, to be adequately reimbursed therefor. So much, his right of property, based on his initial labor, gives him a moral right to demand. But when his capital is returned to him in as good order as when he parted with it, the capitalist's property right, so far as it rests on his own labor, is satisfied. He has again all that his own labor produced. He is precisely in the same position in which his own labor originally placed him, with his newly created capital as the reward of his toil. True, he has been deprived of its use for a period, but the theory of "abstinence," as justifying a return to the capitalist, has been definitely abandoned by economists of all schools.

The capitalists' right of property being satisfied by the restoration of his capital in good order, what is to become of the balance of "interest," that is, of the remaining portion of that increment of wealth attributable to the use of capital? Remember, that interest is the product of natural qualities, principles and forces, themselves not created by any human agency, but as much a divine donation to all men as is the land, with which, in fact, they may readily be identified. "The laws of matter, in short, make capital productive," and the laws of matter surely are the common inheritance of all mankind. It seems impossible to escape the conclusion that, if the land is morally a common property, so also is the productive potency of capital; and if, in consequence, land cannot function as a criterion of distribution, neither can capital, except in so far as it does indeed represent and figuratively reproduce "stored up labor," a consideration of little practical moment. As the productive potency of capital is a natural resource, untrammelled by private preemption, the yield therefrom would go to the first appropriators of this potency, or, in other words, to the actual users of the instruments of toil. "Interest," like rent, is to be rendered to labor, which thus becomes the sole, valid criterion of distribution, and the only moral basis of the right of property.

A criticism of a practical sort may be briefly anticipated. The quantity of land is limited, and the exaction of rent therefor becomes practicable, being analogous to the tribute extorted by a monopoly. The quantity of capital is, however, practically unlimited, and the leverage by which the capitalist secures interest is not so plain. But while there is no natural limit on the volume of capital, there are effective bars to its general ownership discoverable in the development of the tools of an archaic industry into the giant plants of modern manufacture and exchange, which are not only beyond the financial reach of the generality, but require a collective operation by workers who, by the very terms of the case, must be without capital of their own. The exaction of interest thus becomes as feasible as that of rent.

CLARENCE MEILY.

EDITORIAL

“Publicity in Party Matters.”

One of the things of which socialists frequently boast is the lack of all secrecy in the conduct of their party affairs. They are proud to contrast their action in this respect with that of the capitalist parties, whose business is carried on by little cliques, sometimes in the back room of a saloon, more often in the office of a corporation attorney.

It is especially interesting as a study in popular psychology to note how often the objection is raised against the socialists that the fact of the maintenance of a party organization prevents everybody who wishes from having a hand in party management. This objection is often seriously advanced by Republicans or Democrats with the obvious implication that things are different in their party, yet it is doubtful if a single one of those who objected to the fact that only socialist party members had any part in determining the platform and candidates in the last socialist election could themselves tell who it was that determined either policy or candidates in any other political party. In the collection of campaign funds, also, this characteristic stands out most strikingly. Whereas, in the capitalist parties, elaborate systems of bookkeeping have been devised, in which each fund is designated by a number, the meaning of which is not known even to the bookkeepers themselves, in order to preserve complete secrecy as to sources of funds and methods of expenditure; in the Socialist party each contribution is acknowledged publicly. The books are audited and the result published to the world.

All this is really, of course, but a necessary part of the essential democracy of the socialist party. The tactics, and indeed all party matters are subject to the direct control of the entire party membership. and if this control is to be intelligent it demands thorough information concerning the matters on which they are expected to act.

One result of this is that, since it is possible to see all of our fights, our opponents are quick to accuse us of having more than our share of disagreements. So it is that the idea has been carefully cultivated that

the socialist party is always torn with internal factions. This accusation will be soberly offered by the democrat for instance as a reason why he does not join the Socialist party. At the same time he seems oblivious of the fact that in most of our large cities it is impossible to hold either a democratic or republican convention without the presence of police to preserve order and that both parties are torn in all directions by a multitude of absolutely antagonistic factions. But since the accuser is generally a member of the rank and file of the party and consequently knows, though almost unconsciously, that he has nothing whatever to do with the settling of these tactics, therefore he is unable to see the beam in his own eye, although the mote in the socialist optic appears of most alarming proportions.

This publicity as an essential part of democracy is of great value. For this very reason we can not afford to misuse it; yet there is a tendency in this direction. The fact that the socialists do not fear to discuss their differences in public, and to bring out the disagreeable features of those differences, has led some socialists to make a virtue of this necessity or rather they have made the disagreeable portion the all important thing in publicity. What is needed here is a sense of proportion. Just because a fight is on in some small local it does not necessarily follow that the socialists all over the country should be forced to take sides or see the work of propaganda shoved one side, in the press or official publications in order to make room for some trifling disagreement, yet this is what is often done. Many a time a disagreement which was only of local interest and could be settled only by local action has been magnified by socialist yellow journalism into a question of national importance. It is no more true that the only thing that needs publicity in the socialist movement is the quarrels, than it is true that the only things that take place in society or form "news" that is worth printing are the scandals and crimes.

Two recent court decisions are of special interest as effecting the possible peaceful progress of a reform movement in the United States. The first is the decision of the United States Supreme Court that the ten hours' law for bakers in New York is unconstitutional. The second is the decision of the Supreme Court of California,* in the Los Angeles case, that the principal of direct recall is unconstitutional. Here we find the pack of little reformers blocked in two directions. Neither the progressive shortening of hours by legislation nor the progressive democratization of government, can proceed in the face of these decisions. The conclusion is inevitable—the conclusion long ago drawn by the Socialists from a host of facts, of which the two just sighted are but additional ones, that we have reached a stage where social progress can only come through revolution. The present ruling class must be overthrown. While they remain in power progressive reform is impossible. All this sounds commonplace,

yet millions of men are unable to appreciate these commonplace truths, and so long as this is true we must repeat them.

We have just received a communication from Comrade Trautman detailing the manner in which he was deposed from the position of editor of the *Brauer Zeitung*. From this it appears that the removal was in direct obedience to an order of the officers of the American Federation of Labor, and that in order to accomplish it under the cover of legality the most high handed methods were used in packing the vote. This is certain to arouse resentment through the United Brewery Workers' organization, and may easily react against the corrupt officials who forced Comrade Trautman from his position.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

Samuel Gompers, president of the A. F. of L., was so greatly pleased with his leading editorial in his personal organ, the *Federationist*, in March, that he followed the same with a second chapter in April, and mayhap we'll be running a serial before we get through. The cause of Mr. Gompers' loquaciousness is not the centralization of capital that is causing the thinking people in every class to give voice to their apprehension, nor the hostile legislation that is contemplated or enacted to teach organized labor its place, nor the damage suits that have been decided or are being filed against trade unions as the natural sequel of the injunction evil that custom, precedent and political jugglery seems to have legalized, nor some of the many other important questions that are of vital importance to organized labor—no, the president of all the unions and the members thereof is discussing the proposed new industrial federation to be formed in Chicago next month and pronouncing the awful curse of his high and mighty holiness upon "the Socialists," who, he declares, "have called another convention to smash the American trade union movement." He does not say that some socialists have called the conference in question, but "the" Socialists, and serenely claims that "this is the sixth 'concentrated' effort in this direction in the last decade." I have already stated in previous numbers of the *Review* that Mr. Gompers, though claiming that he is acquainted with Socialist philosophy, principles and literature, never discusses those fundamentals, but uses his official prestige to attack individuals and, in an underhanded way, the Socialist party, as well as trade unionists who dare to advocate the doctrine of socialism without consulting the wishes of the "little father" at Washington. In making the reckless and unfounded charge that "the" Socialists are aiming "to smash the trade union movement," he is maliciously attempting to throw discredit upon the Socialist party, otherwise he would have been honest enough to state that some twenty odd persons were trying to form a rival organization, and then he could have decently explained the error of taking such a course, as would befit the dignity of the honorable position in which he is rattling around like a narrow-minded factionist. Mr. Gompers knows that the A. L. U. movement of 1894—after the A. R. U. sacrificed itself in attempting to rescue the white slaves of Pullman—was populist, as was the St. Louis conference later, in which many single taxers, anarchists and some very "good" trade unionists also participated. He knows, too, that De Leon's S. T. and L. A. was surreptitiously sprung at a banquet tendered to delegates who were Socialists at the New York convention of the A. F. of L., and that when the alliance was endorsed by the old Socialist Labor party the following year, only upon the express understanding that no

dual unions were to be formed, and when this promise was violated that the trade unionists and sympathizers seceded from the S. L. P. and practically destroyed that party, which is more than our Republican and Democratic brethren have ever done notwithstanding the attempts of their parties and bosses to smash organized labor with injunctions, militia, police and bad laws and decisions. Gompers knows, furthermore, that the Socialist party had no hand in organizing the Western Federation of Labor, nor had any great number of Socialist individuals—in fact, the latter were largely outnumbered by old party voters which the election returns from Colorado and other Rocky mountain states clearly demonstrate. He is also well aware of the fact that the great mass of the Socialist party voters are members of the A. F. of L., pay their dues (and his salary), go on strike and boycott when necessary, and are undoubtedly just as decent as he pretends to be. Evidently Mr. Gompers is envious of the rapid growth of the Socialist party and fears that his own personality may be overshadowed; that the workers are likely to become tired of his everlasting phrasemongering and generalizations and wornout policies and pay a bit more attention to their political power, especially since the pressure from the trusts and the open shop fanatics has aroused widespread discussion and is causing hundreds of former conservative trade unionists to declare that a political movement must be formed to deal with these new questions. It is also quite popular as yet (especially in the National Civic Federation) to attack the Socialists, while Republicans and Democrats are quite immune, no matter if they scuttle unions by the score. Then, again, Mr. Gompers shrewdly believes that he can quell the growing dissatisfaction among his own followers and secure re-election by setting up a loud noise against the wicked Socialists. He has played that game before and subdued revolt by posing as a martyr. I know that Gompers and his close friends eagerly scan many Socialist publications to watch for criticism or attacks upon his policies, and anyone present at the last few conventions can recall how these squibs were solemnly paraded before the delegates and twisted into every form of abuse of not himself alone, but the whole trade union movement. "I am the state," etc. If some obscure Socialist sheet in New York or the backwoods of Minnesota contained a protest against Gompers and called him names "the" Socialists and "you" Socialists were roundly belabored, just as though the delegates in the convention were responsible for the acts of every pencil-pusher in the land. The Gompersites are always abused, to hear them tell it, but when they denounce the Socialists as "dreamers," "dope fiends," "rainbow chasers" and a whole lot of other things and dangle the skeleton of delectionism that isn't abuse. Now comes Gompers and deliberately misrepresents the Socialist party and slanders thousands of members of the trade unions who are affiliated with that party by charging that "the Socialists have called another convention to smash the American trade union movement." This should be swallowed without a word of protest along with his sneers that the adoption of the resolutions endorsing the trade union movement by the Chicago Convention of the Socialist party a year ago, and subsequently in a referendum vote, was not meant in good faith, and likewise his cumbrous effort to connect the Socialists with "Comrade" Parry because some individual out in Denver or Podunk denounced the unions. I don't know whether Gompers is beginning a campaign to drive those who believe in socialism out of the trade unions, but his studied insults indicate that he is. However, I dispute his right to question the sincerity of the Chicago national convention and the referendum vote or to read me or any other Socialist out of any union in the A. F. of L. Moreover, I am not undertaking a defense of the new movement, and I want to go on record right here as expressing the opinion

that those who contemplate forming the opposition industrial federation are making a serious mistake, as I stated in a communication to the conferees in January. The trade union questions will be fought out within the present organizations, just as the differences that may arise in the Socialist party will have to be settled in that party. But the actions of a few impatient individuals in jumping the traces and going contrary to the letter and spirit of the Chicago Convention do not justify Samuel Gompers' sweeping charge that "the" Socialists are trying to smash the unions and that the declarations of the aforesaid convention were made for "vote-getting" purposes and were thereupon tossed into the wastepaper basket. I expect to be in Pittsburg to attend the next convention of the A. F. of L. as a delegate from the Typographical Union. Mr. Gompers will represent the Cigarmakers' Union. He will carry a paid-up card and so will I, and, therefore, we are equal before the trade union membership (unless he considers himself a boss rather than a servant). I gladly renew my challenge to meet him in a public debate to prove, first, that the endorsement of the trade union movement by the Socialist party was not in good faith, or, second, that said Socialist party was directly or indirectly concerned in the formation of the proposed new federation, or, thirdly, that socialism is wrong in principle. He may arrange the time and I agree to pay one-half the expense. Is that fair?

The echoes of the subway and elevated railway strikes in New York are still being heard. The Central Federated Union of that city appointed a committee to visit August Belmont and arrange for the reinstatement of the men. But despite the fact that that gentleman is hailed in certain quarters as "a workingman's friend," he declared that fully 2,000 men would never receive jobs again on the roads and that the open shop system would prevail. A great hubbub has been made that the men broke their agreements, but while that may have been technically true the Belmont plutocrats practically drove them into doing so. A delegate in the C. F. U. from the railway employees stated that constant wage cutting had been taking place in the service and that some of the men had been reduced from \$2.40 to \$1.40 per day. He quoted Belmont as saying, when for political reasons an agreement was signed last fall, that said contract would cost the company an additional million dollars a year. But through recent jugglery, the delegate explained, Belmont cut into the general wage fund something like \$5,000,000 a year. A writer in a New York weekly magazine, in a review of the trouble, quotes Farley, the strike-breaker, who was given a personal present of \$25,000 by Belmont, as saying that he had been preparing for a year for the strike; that he (Farley) had received \$1,000 a day for sixty days prior to the walkout, besides two fees of \$10,000 each. Farley, who is now said to be a millionaire, claims to have an army of 8,000 to 10,000 scabs, and after the New York strike he sent some of his band to Pittsburg, where they crushed all efforts of the street railway employees in that city to better their conditions, and another crowd was sent to the Pacific Coast by Belmont's pet in anticipation of trouble in San Francisco, where the corporationists declare they will run the open shop. The New York C. F. U. has requested that all affiliated unions demand that their national officers withdraw from the National Civic Federation, where they are members. In a number of other cities heated debates have occurred recently in which the Civic Federation was roundly denounced.

The damage suit industry continues to flourish. The latest union to be hit is the plumbers'. The New Orleans local, for good and sufficient cause, expelled two members. They went into court and secured judgment for \$1,000 each and a mandate was also issued that they be reinstated by the union. It has already been noted in the *Review* that the Supreme Court of Vermont compelled the machinists of Rutland to pay

\$2,500 to an unfair concern which they boycotted. Now it is stated that they are also required to pay an additional thousand dollars as costs. The courts are evidently determined, judging from half a dozen decisions that have been rendered against organized workers, to mulct treasuries whether or not unions are incorporated and also grab whatever little property individual members may have accumulated by hard work, saving and self-denial. But the pure and simple organs are significantly silent upon this question. The American Federationist, for instance, can rail against dues payers who believe in socialism and print a lot of warmed-over stuff about what Gompers said somewhere, and all the other little organs contain an endless desert of words, boilerplate and paid political ads., but they are utterly deaf, dumb and blind to the greatest menace that organized labor must face now and in the future—the danger of having treasuries confiscated and even the roofs taken from over the heads of members.

"Labor's Friend" Roosevelt not only went on record in favor of the open shops in the Miller case and by appointing Paul Morton secretary of the navy and Senator Quarles to a United States judgeship, but the Pittsburg papers announce that he offered H. C. Frick a position in his cabinet, which the latter declined, as he may "fill Mark Hanna's shoes" as chairman of the Republican national committee. But the last straw is the announcement from Denver that the unspeakable Bell, of bull pen infamy has been offered the position of special agent to Venezuela from the U. S. Bell admitted having received the offer and had it under advisement. Yet a lot of lackeys are telling us that Roosevelt is as big a man as Washington or Lincoln were and is labor's friend!

SOCIALISM ABROAD

JAPAN.

The war has had the effect of nearly crushing the socialist movement out of existence. However, the Japanese Comrades repeat in their publications that the real sentiment towards socialism is growing constantly and feel sure that the close of the war will see a rapid growth.

The following item taken from a recent issue of a Japanese Socialist paper gives us another view of a woman who has been occupying considerable space in the public press of America.

"Some time ago, the carriage of Marchioness Sutematsu Oyama (wife of Fieldmarshal Marquis Oyama, Commander-chief of the Japanese army in Manchuria) had run over an aged woman, wounding her in the face. The poor injured instituted a case against the honorable lady demanding an indemnity of 650 yen, but the case was dismissed in the Tokyo Appeal Court a few days ago. Though we expected such an outcome from the beginning, yet at this unfortunate realization, we can not help pitying, that the judicial independence is not assured for the helpless in Japan."

FRANCE.

One more step has now been taken towards the completion of unity, the *Parti Socialiste Français* held its congress at Rouen during the past month. This congress was really to fix the terms of unity. There was but one question to be solved and this was a question of the relation of the socialist deputies to the party organization. Owing to the lack of a compact party organization capable of enforcing discipline, the French socialist deputies, aside from those elected by the Guesdists, have always declared themselves responsible only to their constituency and have constituted a little group, to a large degree hostile to the socialist party organization. It was made one of the conditions of party unity that the parliamentary fraction should be subject to the party organization. The deputies refused to accept this condition and the congress was held to settle this question. We have had occasion to criticise Jaures in these columns many times, but we wish to extend to him the credit which is his due for his work at Rouen. Throughout the convention he stood for unity and discipline, and in a speech which lasted nearly half a day, he went over all of the questions which had been raised concerning the *bloc* tactics, voting for the secret fund, and the general budget and at all points took a firm stand for a disciplined united party. As a result quite largely of his efforts, coupled with those of Comrade

Longuet, whose writings at least are known to most of our readers, the convention decided to work for a united well disciplined party. Some of the deputies refused to accept the discussion. Gabriel Deville, the well known translator and popularizer of Marx, is one of these. He has sent a resignation to the socialist parliamentary fraction and declares these he will henceforth act as an independent socialist. This, however, really means almost nothing since he had already been expelled from the socialist party for compromising. Normand has also resigned, giving as his reason an excuse, which has grown gray with age in French Socialist politics and has been offered as an explanation for all sorts of confused tactics, that he is needed "to defend the Republic." The first convention of the united party was held April 23d in Paris. At this conference the final terms of unity were completed.

GERMANY.

The French capitalist press has recently been at the old game of praising the Socialists of other countries as so much superior to the native product, whereupon Comrade Bebel sent the following letter:

Dear Comrade Jaures:

You have furnished me with a pleasant hour in sending me the articles from the "Temps" and "Gaulois," which set me up as a model of patriotism in order to thereby discredit you by the comparison. I am not the only one however whom this article must have amused, for our ministers must also have laughed to see me pointed out as so prominent a pillar of the present political system. Our enemies are truly comical. In Germany it is you and your friends who are held up as models, while in France it is we who must serve as examples of patriots. The "Gaulois and "Temps" may rest easy. Since the German Social Democracy first entered the Reichstag some thirty years ago, it has never voted for a military or naval appropriation, and has always opposed the general budget, and this has always been done for the following three reasons: 1, because we have no faith in the representatives of the present state, who treat the laborers as a secondary class of citizens; 2, because we condemn the whole foundation of our military system as undemocratic and hostile to the people; 3, because the funds which support the German army and navy come from the customs and indirect taxes levied upon the consumption of the laborers, which are as unjust as they are oppressive. Moreover the German Kaiser has frequently preached to the soldiers the duty of being prepared, at his command, to shoot their own fathers and mothers. We would indeed be a miserable crew if we were to support such a system as this. I am glad, dear comrade Jaures, that in your article in "Humanite," you have so effectively answered your opponents. But it will accomplish nothing. When our opponents cease to lie about and slander us, it will be when they are at the end of their string, and the last hour of their domination has sounded. If you wish to publish this, I have no objections.

BOOK REVIEWS

"THE LABOR PROBLEM," by Thomas S. Adams & Helen L. Sumner. The MacMillan Company. Cloth, 579 pp. \$1.75.

It is interesting to know that the "labor problem" has now reached what students call the "text book stage." The present work being the first in the field, must naturally share the defects of pioneer work. On the whole, however, if we judge it by the standard of a text book it is very satisfactory. The work is marred, however, according to our opinion, by a conformity to the scholastic idea of the treatment of social problems which prevails in most of our universities. According to this idea one must never be a partisan and must especially be careful of making any generalization. This is shown in the opening sentence where we are told that "There is no one labor problem whose solution would carry with it the settlement of all others." In a technical scholastic sense this is true but as a matter of fact the labor problem as a contest for better conditions between employer and employed is something inherent in capitalism, and the labor problem is the problem of capitalism. We are glad to note that this same introductory chapter recognizes the existence of a class struggle. "For the masses, indeed, it is true and increasingly true, that once a wage-earner always a wage-earner. This permanency of status makes the labor problem in one respect a class struggle. The laborer feels that he is permanently held within a class whose interests are, in part, antagonistic to those of the employers with whom he bargains and higgles over wages. Fortunately or unfortunately, too, industry becomes more highly capitalized as time passes, making it increasingly difficult for men to acquire industrial independence, and steadily reducing the proportionate number of those who can set up establishments of their own."

On the whole the comparative historical method is followed quite closely. The chapter on "Woman and Child Labor," "Immigration," "The Sweating System," "Poverty," "Strikes and Boycotts," "Labor Organizations" and "Employers' Associations," "Industrial Education," "Labor Laws" and the "Material Progress of the Wage Earning Classes" present in a quite satisfactory form an elementary history of the labor problem in the United States, and the titles give a good-idea of the subject matter. It should be said in this connection that the analytical table of contents and an excellent index are of great help in the use of the book.

On the sweating system we are told that one of the most healthy signs is the appearance of the factory system in the manufacture of clothing. This is undoubtedly true, yet it certainly must leave something to be desired when we learn that "in these factories the workers are pushed to the greatest possible exertion." We may be sure of the victory of the factory if this succeeding statement is true that "every

coat passes through thirty hands and comes out fourteen minutes quicker, and four cents cheaper than from the task shop."

The chapter on "Poverty, Earnings and Unemployment" is exceptionally full of information, although it is to a considerable degree supplanted by Robert Hunter's recent work on the same subject.

When we come to the portion dealing with remedies we have the same old ridiculous stuff that has been poured out from the dilettante, library confined students of society for the last twenty years. In just what way strikes and boycotts are included under "Remedies" it is hard to understand, since they are really signs of conflict. The same is largely true of "Laborers' Organizations and Employers' Associations," although the matter contained in these two chapters is by far the most valuable portion of this part of the work.

Why "Profit Sharing" should occupy nearly fifty pages of any work at this day and age when its utter failure to in any way meet industrial problems has been so thoroughly demonstrated is hard to understand. The final chapter on the "Material Progress of the Wage Earning Class" is the best in the book. We are somewhat surprised to note, however, the omission in the bibliography of McMasters' little work on the "Acquisition of Political, Social and Industrial Rights in America." On the whole, however, the bibliography affords little to criticise and forms a most valuable addition to the work. Each chapter has a list of works covering subject matter and on the whole these are extremely well chosen. Just why socialism should have been so carefully tabooed throughout the work is a little hard to understand. In spite of this fact the work fills a place which has long been vacant, for a book which can be recommended to the beginner who wishes to gain a knowledge of the facts which are essential to even an intelligent discussion of the labor problem.

"WHAT IS SO AND WHAT ISN'T," by John M. Work, published by J. A. Wayland, Paper 96 pp. 15 cents.

A well written, popular answer to some common objections to socialism. Easily read, suggestive and on the whole a valuable little propaganda pamphlet, and enough different in style and matter from the majority of such works to justify its existence.

"CAUSES OF THE UNION SHOP POLICY", by John R. Commons.

This article, re-printed from the last proceedings of the American Economic Association, is almost the only scholarly and in any way adequate treatment of this subject. The socialists will mainly quarrel with the conclusion, which, however, is rather implied than directly stated, that trades unions and employers' associations as the principal contracting parties, on the basis of a closed shop forms a stage of stable social equilibrium.

SOCIOLOGIE ECONOMIQUE, by Guillaume De Greef, Felix Alcan, Paris, France.

The well known sociologist and socialist (he himself would make the two terms identical) of Belgium here makes a valuable contribution to the literature of social thought. The method is strictly the comparative historical. He begins with a study of "social economy" studying the various schools that have appeared in the past and giving full and fair treatment to the contributions of the socialist writers. This is followed by a study of the different methods of social economics and a history of the same subject. He goes to considerable pains to show that Marx was not the originator of the economic interpretation of history, but it seems to us that here his work is rather strained and that after all he does not succeed in detracting in any way from the credit which belongs to Marx and Engels. There is much in the chapter on historical materialism that

is well worth translating and we may present some of it to our readers in a later issue, although we believe that the work is marred rather than improved by what the author evidently considers of great importance—an attempt to reconcile economic materialism with philosophical dualism.

THE RECORDING ANGEL, by *Edwin Arnold Brenholtz*. Charles H. Kerr and Co. Cloth, 287 pp. \$1.00.

We shall not say of this that it is *the* Socialist novel, for we believe that the stirring times in which we are now living and which the next few years will bring, will produce yet stronger and greater works. But we have no hesitation in saying that of all those who have sought to write such a work, up to the present time, Comrade Brenholtz has come the nearest to accomplishing his great object. One thing is certain, he has succeeded in avoiding the defect which has marred the majority of those that have preceded him—he has written an absorbingly interesting book. Chambers, the private secretary of a great trust magnate, installs a marvelously perfect phonograph in the private car of his employer. This machine records the most private conversation of the capitalist with his attorney and secretary. A great strike comes on, in which it seems as if the very existence of capitalism is at stake. At a critical moment Chambers uses the information thus gained to extort money from his employer for the use of the strikers, leading him to believe that his conversations had been taken down by a remarkably expert stenographer, who demanded these sums as the price of his silence. Around these incidents is woven a plot with romance and tragedy in plenty. It is possible to criticise the author somewhat in his handling of conversation, where he does not always show the skill of a trained craftsman, yet no one can deny to him or his work the possession of three important characteristics, strength, interest, and a novel plot. He has also succeeded in accomplishing something else that has ordinarily not been attained by writers of socialist novels, he has made the socialism an integral part of his story, and a natural growth without any such cheap expedients as long argumentative orations or essays.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

NOW READY: THE EVOLUTION OF MAN.

BY WILHELM BOELSCHKE.

When Darwin gave to the world his theory of Evolution, he did not give complete proof of the truth of the theory; he showed the way to find the evidence. A generation of scientists have been working along the line of Darwin's discoveries, and the evidence has been found.

Intelligent scientists have long ago ceased to argue the question of whether the evolution theory is true; they have accepted it as proved, and they are daily applying it in new discoveries.

Readers of popular books have, however, been left without information of the latest developments in science, and it has still been possible for priests, sentimentalists, reactionaries and yellow journalists to assert that Darwinism was a discredited theory, without being laughed at.

In Germany as well as America this need of popular scientific literature has been realized, and now something has been done. Prof. Wilhelm Boelsche, long recognized as one of the greatest biologists of Europe, has summed up the latest results of scientific research in a little book which is at once comprehensive, trustworthy and easily understood.

This work has been translated into English by Ernest Untermann, and is now published under the title of *The Evolution of Man*. It traces the ancestry of man back through the cave-man contemporary with the mammoth, and thence down through the lower forms of life until we reach the animal composed of a single cell. And even here the author shows that there is no break in the life-process, for he makes it clear that the cell is formed by precisely the same forces that are at work in the matter which we have been taught to call inorganic.

To socialists the facts that are popularized in this book are of an importance that we can hardly rate too highly. If we can see things in their proper relations, many costly mistakes will be avoided. The wider outlook will cure two opposite tendencies, both wasteful of effort—the sentimentalism which mourns over the materialistic conception of socialism without understanding it, and the "impossibilism" which imagines that the whole life of the universe can be stated in terms of "surplus value."

"*The Evolution of Man*" is a book that every socialist who wishes to be a more thorough student and a more effective worker for socialism will desire to read. Moreover, it is a book of immense propaganda value. Socialism is the logical outcome of evolution, while the main prop of capitalism is the outgrown creed that an all-powerful Creator decreed that things should remain just as we find them today. "*The Evolution of Man*" can be offered to the "worker with the capitalist mind" without greatly alarming his prejudices, and when he has read it, he will find his whole philosophy of life undermined, and he will be ready to listen to socialist arguments as never before.

"*The Evolution of Man*" is the first volume of a new series, the "Library of Science for the Workers." It is illustrated with numerous engravings, well printed on good paper, and handsomely bound in cloth with appropriate stamping especially designed for the new series. It will be mailed to any address for fifty cents, or to any stockholder in our co-operative publishing house for thirty cents.

We have made arrangements for translating and publishing more of these popular scientific works, including "The Triumph of Life" and "The Family of Animals," by William Boelsche, "The Sense-Life of Plants," by R. Francé, and "The End of the World" and "The Birth of the World," by Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer. Ernest Untermann also has in preparation two original works for the same series—"The Evolution of Evolution" and "Man's Conquest of His Environment."

The time for publishing these books will depend entirely upon our success in raising the needed capital. The cost of each book will be about four hundred dollars. If forty socialists will without delay send ten dollars each for a share of stock, we can start a translator at work on the second volume of the series and put it through the press by midsummer, and if forty more shares can be paid for by July, a third volume can be ready in August. A united effort will make it easily possible to publish at least six of these books by the end of 1905, and once published, they will be a source of income to the publishing house for years.

No dividends and no fancy salaries are paid. Any profit on books will be used either to repay money lent by stockholders, or to bring out additional books. Full particulars regarding the organization of the co-operative publishing house will be mailed on request.

MARXISM.

This is the general title of a series of articles by Mr. Louis B. Boudin, beginning in the May number of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. They are of exceptional value now when the principles which Marx laid down are making such inroads into all fields of thought, even outside the socialist movement, and when within that movement opposing views on tactics are being urged, each justifying itself on the ground that it is a correct application of Marxism. In the preparation of these articles Comrade Boudin, who has the advantage of a thorough command of several lan-

guages, has made a careful study of the extensive Marxian literature. The special topics to be discussed in the several articles are:

- I. Introduction. (Karl Marx and His Critics.)
- II. The Materialistic Conception of History and the Class Struggle. (Exposition of the Doctrine.)
- III. The Materialistic Conception of History and the Class Struggle. (Criticism of the Doctrine.)
- IV. Value and Surplus-Value. (Exposition and Criticism.)
- V. The Mechanics of Capitalistic Production. (Exposition and Criticism of the Theories of Commercial Crises and the final breakdown of the System, Trust as Regulators of Production, Capitalistic Accumulation.)
- VI. The Laws of Capitalistic Development. (Exposition and Criticism of the Theories of "The Army of the Unemployed," "The Impoverishment of the Working Class," "The Disappearance of the Middle Class," the Social Influence of Trusts and Corporations in General.)
- VII. Final Results. (The Relations of Theory and Practice, Some of the Causes of the New Movement, and Some of the Results.)

It will readily be seen that this series of articles will be of immense value to every thinking socialist. And the other matter that has been published and will be published in *THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* is nearly or quite as valuable to those socialists who care to have something more than a superficial knowledge of socialism. Unfortunately the number of these has not thus far been enough to pay the cost of publishing the *REVIEW*, and there has been a constant deficit, which has been made up directly or indirectly by the stockholders of the co-operative publishing house.

THE FINANCES OF THE PUBLISHING HOUSE.

During the month of April the contributions toward paying the debt were \$5.00 from A. L. Nagel of Kentucky, \$3.55 from Alex. Fraser of New York, and \$2.50 from Gus Weiss of California. The debt to outsiders is now practically paid off, so that no considerable amounts are due except to our own stockholders, though some of these need their money and ought to be paid at once.

The monthly sales of books are larger than ever before, and are enough to pay the ordinary current expenses. The publishing house would therefore be in a healthy condition but for one fact, namely, that the receipts on the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW* do not pay expenses.

During the month of April the total receipts of the *REVIEW* from all sources, including subscriptions and sales of bound volumes and single copies, amounted to \$102.26, while the outlay for printing, paper, postage and editorial work was \$217.75.

If the readers of the *REVIEW* want it continued, it will be necessary for them to support it in an entirely different fashion from this. The

total cost of publication each year, including postage, clerk hire, office rent and a portion of the manager's time, in addition to the items named in the last paragraph, is about four thousand dollars. This could be covered if all who have been receiving the REVIEW would pay the full price of a dollar a year for it, but this they seem unwilling to do.

Are you in favor of continuing the REVIEW? The way to vote yes is to send several new subscriptions at a dollar each. The way to vote no is to do nothing.